National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SIDNEY HOWARD GAY, EDITOR. Without Concealment....Without Compromise. EDMUND QUINCY, JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, } CORRESPONDING EDITORS.

VOL. XI....NO. 11. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, AUGUST 8, 1850. WHOLE NO. 531

Published Weekly.
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
AT 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK.
TERMS:
TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to S. H. GAY, New York.

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY may be forwarded to FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer, at Boston; or S. H. GAY, New York.

Norris & Brother, Printers.

Selections.

MR. CLAY'S SPEECH
ON THE COMPROMISE BILL.

SENATE....Monday, July 22, 1850.

The Compromise bill coming up, Mr. FOOTE submitted an amendment restricting the limits of California by the line of 35° 30', and providing a Government for the territory thus cut from the present limits of California. Upon this amendment, and upon the bill itself, Mr. CLAY then addressed the Senate as follows:

Mr. PRESIDENT—I hope that this amendment will not be pressed at this moment, but that we shall have some time for its consideration. It is known to the Senate that it has been my hope and expectation that we should dispose of all of the amendments either proposed or to be proposed to the bill, and that upon the question of its engrossment, I intended, with the permission of the Senate, to occupy some portion of its time in taking a rapid review of some of the objections that have been made to the adoption of the measure under consideration, and then to submit it into their hands, in which by the Constitution of the country the responsibility is placed.—The events of Saturday, of which the Senate possess information deprived us of the opportunity of employing that day in the consideration of those amendments which were intended to be submitted or were yet before the Senate. But as some rather impatient anxiety has been manifested to arrive at the conclusion of this important subject, an anxiety in which to some extent I share with others, I have risen this morning to perform a duty toward the Committee and to the subject, which my position prompts me to endeavor to execute.

I say some impateince has been manifested. I do not mean it in any unkind sense. The Hon. Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Hale) who now sits on my left, has upon two occasions moved to lay this bill upon the table; and his motion was made with all the consciousness of power, as if he felt perfectly secure not merely of the general result, but in his being co-operated with by all the opponents of the bill. It is true the Senator finally most graciously condescended to withdraw his motion to lay the bill upon the table, at my instance, for which I am profoundly grateful. But as I do not desire again to place myself in any attitude of solicitation in regard to the progress and final disposition of this bill, I have risen, I repeat, now, to perform a duty which appertains to my position.

Mr. President: In the progress of this debate it has been again and again argued that perfect tranquility reigns throughout the country, that there is no disturbance threatening its peace or endangering its safety, but that which was produced by busy, restless politicians. It has been maintained that the surface of the public mind is perfectly smooth and undisturbed by a single billow. I most heartily wish I could concur in this picture of general tranquility, that has been drawn upon both sides of the Senate. I am no alarmist, nor, I thank God, at the advanced age which His Providence has been pleased to allow me to reach, I am not very easily alarmed by any human events. But I totally misread the signs of the times if there be that state of profound peace and quiet, that absence of all just cause for apprehension of future danger to this Confederacy, which appears to be entertained by some other senators. Mr. President, all the tendencies of the times, I lament to say, are toward disquietude, if not more fatal consequences. When before in the midst of profound peace with all the nations of the earth, have we seen a Convention, representing a considerable portion of one great part of the Republic, meet together to deliberate about measures of future safety in connection with great interests of that quarter of the country? When before have we seen, not one, but more—some half a dozen legislative bodies—solemnly resolving that if any one of three measures—the admission of California, the adoption of the Wilmot Proviso, or the abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia—should be adopted by Congress, measures of an extreme character for the safety of the great interests to which I refer, in the particular section of the country, would be resorted to? For years, this subject of the abolition of Slavery, even within the District of Columbia, small as is the number of slaves here, has been a source of constant irritation and disquiet.—So of the subject of fugitive slaves who have escaped from their lawful owners; not a mere border contest, as has been supposed—although there, undoubtedly, it has given rise to more irritation than in other portions of the Union—but everywhere through the slaveholding country it has been felt as a great evil—a great wrong, which required the intervention of Congressional power. But these two subjects, unpleasant as has been the agitation to which they have given rise, are nothing in comparison to those which have sprung out of the acquisitions recently made from the Republic of Mexico. Sir, there are not only great and leading causes of just apprehension as respects the future, but all the minor circumstances of the day indicate danger ahead, whatever may be its final issue and consequence. The establishment of a paper in this city, a sectional paper—(and I wish I could say upon all occasions it propagated truth with more attention than in a particular instance it has done)—a sectional paper is established here to espouse not the interests of the entire Union, but the interests of a particular section. The allusion which I made with regard to a departure from the truth which has incidentally come to my notice, was called forth by an assertion recently made that in the State of Kentucky there was great difference and diversity of opinion upon the subject of the adoption of this measure, and that the Constitutional Convention of that State had unanimously, or nearly unanimously rejected a proposition in favor of the Compromise. Why, directly the reverse is the fact. I should not have noticed it at all, had I not observed on yesterday that it was copied in a paper in Mobile, and was spoken of as an undoubted fact, that even in the State of Kentucky there was great division on the subject of the Compromise. I will say in my place, and with the authority which appertains to my position, that for fifty years I have never known so much unanimity upon any question in that State. It is a State from which I received a letter from a gentlemen formerly a democratic member of Congress—known very well to my friend from Indiana, now in my eye, from the County of Henry, one of the most populous counties in that State, in which there is a majority of democratic voters—and of which majority of 1,900 voters—this gentleman, an honorable gentleman, I am proud to say, though I differ from him in politics, says that, as far as he knows or believes, there is not a solitary individual to oppose it; and the Constitutional Convention of Kentucky, instead of opposing, by a unanimous vote of the body, expressed its approbation of this pending measure.

One of the misfortunes of the times is the difficulty of penetrating the Northern mind with truth—to make it sensible to the dangers which are ahead—to make it comprehend the consequences which are to result from this or that course—to make it give a just appreciation to all the events which have occurred, are occurring, or which inevitably must occur. I said minor as well as major circumstances and events were all tending rapidly, as I fear, to a fatal issue of the matters in controversy between the different portions of the Union.

I have seen a pamphlet—and it has been circulated with great industry—containing an exposition of Political Economy, written in a style well calculated to strike the mind of the masses, but full of error and exaggeration from one end of it to the other—errors of every sort, setting forth in the strongest terms the supposed disadvantages resulting from the existence of this Union to the Southern portion of the Confederacy, and portraying in the most lively hues the benefits which would result from separating and setting up for themselves.

Mr. President, I will not now dwell upon other concomitant causes, all having the same tendency and all well calculated to awaken, to arouse us—if, as I hope the fact is, we are all of us sincerely desirous of preserving this Union—to rouse us to dangers which actually exist, without underrating them upon the one hand nor magnifying them upon the other.

"Sir, it was in this stage or state rather of the Republic, that my friend from Mississippi (Mr. Foote,) something more than four months ago, made a motion for the appointment of a Committee of Thirteen. Unlike what occurred at an analogous period of the Republic, when it was my duty to make a similar motion in the other end of the Capitol, and when, on account of the benefits which might result from the reconciliation of a distracted country, the proposition was immediately adopted—in the present occasion, unlike what occurred at that historical period, the proposition of the Honorable Senator from Mississippi was resisted from day to day, from week to week, for four or five weeks;—an experiment to restore the harmony of the country met with the most determined and settled resistance, as if the measure which the Committee might report, whatever might be its character, would not still be under the power and control of the Senate, to be disposed of by it according to its own best judgment. Finally, however, the motion prevailed. A majority of the Senate ordered the Committee to be appointed. And among the reproaches which were brought forward against that appointment of the Committee by the Senator from Massachusetts, now in my eye, (Mr. Davis) it was stated that it was organized and created by only a bare majority of the Senate. Sir, does such a reproach as that lie in the mouth of the Senator, or of others who acted with him? A sense of my duty in this body, or in any other body of which I am a member, prompts me to respect the opinion of the majority of the Senate, and to conform to it so far as is consistent with my views, and when not so to record my vote along with the minority. But in this case, upon the constitution of the Committee, but about 30 or 31 Members voted at all, because the Honorable Senator and others who concurred with him in opposing the Committee chose to sit in sullen silence, although members of the body—a minority of the body, it is true—without voting, as it was their duty to do. Is this contumacy on their part now to be made a ground of objection to the character, constitution, or labors of the Committee?

Well, the Committee was finally raised, and went out. Of its composition it does not become me to speak, nor is it necessary to say anything.—The country, the Senate, will judge of that. Without, however, saying a word in respect to the humble person who now addresses you, I may be permitted to remark that a large portion of that Committee consisted of gentlemen who had honorably served their country in the highest stations at home and abroad—men of ripe experience, and whose large acquaintance with public affairs entitled them at least to respectful consideration, when they were engaged in the holy office, if I may use the expression, of trying to reconcile the discordant parts of this distracted country. After having expended some two weeks upon their labors in their chamber, they agreed upon a report deliberately made. It had hardly been presented, before all sorts of epithets were applied to the Committee. They were called the thirteen doctors, and the Hon. Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Dayton) seemed not only disposed to deny their healing powers, but to intimate even that they were thirteen quacks—[laughter]—that instead of bringing forward a measure to cure and heal the public disease, they had brought forward a measure that only aggravated the disorders of the country, and was calculated to threaten it with more agitation.

Mr. President, I need not use one word of recriminating language. I leave it to the Senate and to the country, and even to the Senators themselves, who have indulged in such expressions, deliberately to consider whether a measure *intended* at any rate as an olive branch, presented under such auspices as this was, ought to have been so treated, and whether the Committee who presented it ought to have been so treated.

Well, sir, the Committee presented their measure, or rather their system of measures co-extensive with all the existing disorders of the country, in relation to the subject of Slavery—a system which, if allowed to produce its beneficent effects, and which I entertain the highest confidence it will produce if it be adopted by Congress—will leave nothing in the public mind to fester and agitate the country.

The three first measures reported by the Committee are those now under consideration—the admission of California, the establishment of territorial governments for Utah and New Mexico, and the settlement of the Boundary of New Mexico and Texas. With respect to the other two measures, I shall say but little at this time. It will be in order to speak of them when they come up for debate. I cannot forego, however, the opportunity of remarking that really I think the Hon. Senator from Virginia (Mr. Hunter) has manifested too much eagerness to go aside to make occasion of fault-finding with the character of these measures. He has misrepresented, I think, not intentionally no doubt, but misrepresented, as you yourself showed very properly, the nature of those bills. But whatever may be their character at present, when they are taken up to be considered by the Senate, it will be in the power of the Senate to modify them according to the wishes of the Hon. Senator from Virginia. In two important particulars that Senator misconceives the character of these two measures. First, in relation to the remedy by record in the recovery of fugitive slaves. That was intended to be, as this colleague could have told him, merely a cumulative remedy to that already in existence.

Mr. MASON [interposing]—I am sure the Senator will indulge me one moment. My colleague is not now in his seat. When he proceeded to discuss the measure upon a former day, he was promptly called to order and not allowed to proceed.

Mr. CLAY—I do not mean to go further than the Senator himself did. I have remarked that I do not mean to argue this question at large. I wish to answer those objections only which were urged, after which I shall pass over the subject. I should have almost concluded by this time, if the honorable Senator had not thought it his duty to interpose. I was merely going to observe, that the remedy of carrying a transcript of the record to the State to which the fugitive had fled, which his colleague alluded to in the bill for recovering fugitive slaves, was merely cumulative, and I also intended to observe that there is nothing in the bill which proposes the abolition of the Slave Trade in the District of Columbia, which prevents the slaveholder from passing through the District *in transitu* with his body-servant—nothing to prevent him from retaining him here in his possession. The only object was to revive the law of Maryland, and declare that if a slave be brought here for sale, then the person who brings him here for that purpose shall be liable to the penalty provided for in the law. But I pass from this subject. I mean to confine myself, while I address the Senate, to the three pending measures.

Mr. HUNTER—Will the Senator from Kentucky allow me to explain. I do not wish to prevent him—because I was called to order—from going into the subject as fully as he may choose. I hope he will be permitted to do so if he has any such desire. In relation to that provision of the act prohibiting the Slave Trade in the District of Columbia, he will find, if he will refer to that resolution, that it contains a prohibition of an introduction of slaves here for the purpose of being transported elsewhere. If that prohibition to transport them elsewhere would not cover the case of a man who has arrested a fugitive and brought him and deposited him here, while on his way home, or that of the man who should be accompanied by his slaves while emigrating to another country, I do not know what language could be framed that would do so. I have not the resolutions by me, or I would read the provision.

Mr. CLAY—I am pretty sure that the honorable Senator is mistaken, and that it will be found so upon looking at the bill. He speaks of resolutions. I put it to the candor of the Senate, why the honorable Senator should go back to resolutions offered by me in the beginning of the session. The question is not with regard to them, or whether they be compatible or not with the measures reported by the Committee, but with respect to the *bill*, which differs in several important particulars from my resolutions. The Committee presented such measures as were agreeable to them; and with respect to the abolition of the Slave Trade in the District of Columbia, it was their intention simply to revive the law of Maryland, and to provide for the case of the introduction of slaves into the District as merchandise.

Mr. HUNTER—The Senator will pardon me; when I used the word "resolutions," I meant the bill, and I find on examination, that the bill is as I have stated.

Mr. CLAY—Very well. With regard to the intention, that is as I have stated; if the language does not effect that intention, we should all be very willing to give it a form acceptable to the Senator from Virginia. The language was only designed to prohibit the Slave Trade, which consists of purchasing and bringing slaves into the District of Columbia, putting them into dépots here for the purpose of being transported to foreign and distant markets. As to an idea which has been mentioned here upon a former occasion, I have already said that if a person residing in the District chooses to go out of the District five or ten miles, and purchase slaves for himself, the law would not prevent him from doing so. But I am taking up more time upon this subject, than I intended. When the proper time arrives for its discussion, the bill will be vindicated from the errors into which I still think the honorable Senator from Virginia has fallen. I have stated that it was my intention to confine my observations to the three measures under consideration. The admission of California as a State, Territorial Goverments for the two Territories, and the establishment of the boundary between Texas and New Mexico.

It is a most remarkable circumstance connected with the debate upon and the progress of this measure, that that feature of the bill supposed to be least likely to encounter objection—that measure, which it has been asserted would draw after it by the force of its own attraction, the other measures contemplated in the bill; it is truly remarkable that the measure of the admission of California has encountered the most of the difficulties which have been developed in the progress of the bill.

The Senator from Lousiana (Mr. Soulé), the Senator from Georgia, (Mr. Berrien), and yourself, sir, (Mr. King,) have all directed your attention mainly to the subject of the boundaries of California, and to the representation proposed for California by the measure under consideration. I believe that with very slight, if any further modifications, all three of the Senators to whom I have alluded, would have been willing, if they could have been satisfied with regard to California, to vote for the whole measure. But it is California which we have been charged with introducing into the bill, for the purpose of purchasing support for other measures; it is California that has created all the difficulties—at least, the chief part of the difficulties—which the bill has encountered.

Now, Mr. President, what may be the ultimate vote which may be given in consequence of the mode in which California is bounded, by the three Senators to whom I have referred, depends upon their own judgment and upon their own proper sense of duty. I must say to them, and I hope they will take it in the same kind and candid spirit in which it is mentioned, that I cannot see the slightest reason why they should reject the whole measure because there is something in it dissatisfactory to them in respect to California. They know that if this measure is defeated, the Chairman of the Committee on Territories (Mr. Douglas) will call up the California bill separately and alone, and that it will be passed as it is, with all its exceptionable features of extended limits and full representation in both Houses, by a considerable majority. Will they, then, on account of the California part of the bill—the passage of which when presented singly may be regarded as inevitable—will they on account of any difficulties not amounting to constitutional difficulties (for, I admit, if gentlemen have, on a deliberate review of their opinions, difficulties of a constitutional nature, nothing could or should overcome them,) will they be constrained, from the necessity resulting from entertaing those opinions, to vote against the entire measure? But as I happen to hold directly the opposite opinions, that there is nothing constitutional in any of the objections taken to the admission of California, and as I trust those Senators will themselves perceive that there is no constitutional ground of objection—that it is altogether a matter of expediency, addressing itself to the sound discretion and deliberate judgment of Congress—I do hope and trust that on account of the objections that exist to the admission of California, when they perceive that it is a part of a great system of reconciliation and harmony to the country, they will not be disposed to reject the benefits and compensations to be found in other parts of the bill; because they know full well that California, just as she is, has presented herself with the representation proposed by the bill, and will be inevitably admitted, provided this bill is defeated. They must also well know that the admission of California alone, without any measure accompanying it, will have the unavoidable tendency of aggravating the sense of wrong and injury, well or ill-founded, that exists in the quarter of the Union from which the Senators to whom I referred come. With respect to the State and Territorial Governments, it is also a fact worthy of remark, that scarcely a Senator who has risen upon this floor has failed to acknowledge the duty of Congress to provide Territorial Governments. Almost every Senator who has spoken on the subject has admitted that Territorial Governments ought to be provided, some wishing for the Wilmot Proviso, and some objecting to the Proviso, but with or without the Wilmot Proviso I have not heard a single Senator say that it was not the bounden duty of Congress to institute Territorial Governments for these Territories.

With regard to another plan of disposing of the question—the plan which, upon a former occasion, I characterized as the Executive plan—of the late President of the United States, I shall have a few observations to make. Allow me to take this occasion, the only suitable one in my opinion, to express my deep regret and my profound sympathy with the family of the deceased. I had known him perhaps longer than any other man in Washington. I knew his father before him—a most estimable and distinguished citizen of Kentucky. I knew the late President of the United States from the time he entered the army until his death, although not seeing him often, in consequence of our operations in different spheres of public duty in our country. He was an honest man. He was a brave man. He had covered his own head with laurels, and had added fame and renown to his country. Without expressing any opinion upon what might have been the just appreciation of his administration of the domestic and civil affairs of the country if Providence had permitted him to serve out his term, I take pleasure in the opportunity of saying, in reference to the foreign affairs of the country, that in all the instances in which any knowledge has been obtained by me of the mode in which they have been conducted by the late Administration, they have met with my hearty and cordial concurrence. During the residue of the remarks which I shall address to you, if I shall have occasion to say anything upon the plan proposed by the late President, it will be with the most perfect respect for his memory; without a single feeling of unkindness abiding in my breast.—Peace be to his ashes, and may he be at this moment enjoying, in another and a better world, that happiness which we are all desirous, sooner or later, to attain.

But, with respect to the difficulty in regard to New Mexico. The plan was, that New Mexico should come in as a State as soon as she had formed herself into a State, adopted her Constitution, and presented it here. Now, Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey, who sits near me, (Mr. Dayton,) argued in this way: "You of the Committee have given to the people of New Mexico the power of legislation, the power to elect their legislators, the power to pass such laws as may be best adapted to their condition; and what is the difference between granting to them the power with which they are so invested, and receiving New Mexico as a member of the Union represented by members in Congress?" Why, Mr. President there is all the difference in the world. There is scarcely any people so low in the scale of civilization—even the Esquimaux, or the Indians on any portion of our Continent—that they may not comprehend and be able to adopt laws suited to their own condition—few, simple, clear, and well understood: for, in their uncivilized state, it is not necessary for them to have a cumbrous code of laws. But it is a wholly different question whether the people of Mexico may not be capable of passing laws adopted to their unripe and half-civilized condition—I speak not of the American portion of the population, but of the Indians—the Pueblo Indians—and some of the half-breeds—it is a very different thing whether they may not be capable of enacting laws suited to their own condition, or whether they should have two Senators on this floor, and members in the other House, to survey the vast and complicated interests of this great Republic, foreign and domestic—to legislate not for themselves only, but for us and our present generation.

For one, I must say that I should be utterly unwilling to receive New Mexico as a State in her present immature condition. A census will be shortly taken, and we shall then know the exact condition of her population. If I am not greatly deceived in my information, it will turn out that there are not perhaps one thousand American citizens within the limits of New Mexico, and perhaps not above eight or ten thousand Mexicans and mixed breeds, exclusive of Pueblo and other Indians, and they are certainly not in a condition to comprehend the duties and attend to the rights and obligations which belong to the exercise of the Government of the people of the United States. It will turn out, I am quite sure, when the returns of the census come in, that there is no stated population in New Mexico such as would justify us in receiving her into the Union, and assigning seats to be occupied by members from that State in—may I not say it?—this august assembly. No; New Mexico was conscious of her own imperfect condition. New Mexico was desirous of a territorial Government. If she has been pushed upon the proposal of a Government of a different form or character to which her population and character did not adapt her, it has only been in consequence of her extreme necessity pressing her to despair of obtaining any Territorial Government with or without the Wilmot Proviso. We all agree about the adjustment of the Texas boundary—a question out of which I must say there is imminent danger springing, if it be not adjusted during the present Session of Congress—one, if not two civil wars—the civil war between the people of New Mexico in resistance to the authority of Texas, to which they are utterly averse, and the civil war lighted up upon the Upper Rio Grande, which may in time extend itself to the Potomac. All, therefore, must agree—all have felt—every Senator who expressed his opinion upon this subject during the progress of this debate, has avowed his conviction of the necessity of an adjustment, a compromise, a settlement of this boundary.

It has been objected against the measure that it is a Compromise. It has been said that it is a compromise of principle, or of *a* principle. Mr. President, What is a Compromise? It is a work of mutual concession—an agreement in which there are reciprocal stipulations—a work in which, for the sake of peace and concord, one party abates his extreme demands in consequence of an abatement of extreme demands by the other party. It is a measure of mutual concession—a measure of mutual sacrifice. Undoubtedly, in all such measures of compromise, one party would be very glad to get what he wants and reject what he does not desire, but what the other party wants. But when he comes to reflect that, from the nature of the Government and its operations, it is necessary on his part, in order to secure what he wants, to grant something to the other side, he should be reconciled to the concession he has made in consequence of the concession which he is to receive—if there is no great principle involved, such as a violation of the Constitution of the United States. I admit that such a Compromise as that ought never to be sanctioned or adopted. But I now call upon any Senator in his place to point out from the beginning to the end, from California to New Mexico, a solitary provision in this bill which is in violation of the Constitution of the United States. Sir, adjustment, in the shape of compromise, may be made without producing any such consequences as have been apprehended. There may be a mutual forbearance. You forbear, upon your side, to insist upon the application of the restriction denominated the Wilmot Proviso. Is there any violation of principle there? The most that can be said—even assuming the power to pass the Wilmot Proviso, which is denied—is, that there is a *forbearance to exercise*, not a *violation of*, the power to pass the Proviso. So, upon the other hand, if there was a power in the United States Constitution authorizing the establishment of Slavery in any of the Territories—a power, however, which is controverted by a large portion of the Senate—if there was a power under the Constitution to establish Slavery, the forbearance to exercise that power is no violation of the Constitution, any more than the Constitution is violated by a forbearance to exercise numerous powers that might be specified, that are granted in the Constitution, and that remain dormant until they come to be exercised by the proper legislative authorities. It is said that the bill presents the state of coercion—that members are coerced, in order to get what they want, to vote for that which they disapprove.—Why, sir, what coercion is there? Is there any coercion in the numerous treaties made by the United States? The treaty in settling the Maine boundary—the treaty in coming from 54 40 down to 49 in Oregon? All treaties which have been made upon commerce, upon boundaries, and other questions from time to time by the United States, upon the principle of mutual and reciprocal concession upon the part of those who made them? Is there any more coercion in this case, than in the passage of a bill containing a variety of provisions some of which you approve, and others of which you disapprove? Can it be said upon the part of our Northern friends, because they have not got the Wilmot Proviso incorporated into the territorial part of the bill that they are coerced—wanting California as much as they do—to vote for the bill, if they do not vote for it? Sir, they might have imitated the noble example of my friend (Mr. Cooper) from that State, upon whose devotion to the Union I place one of my greatest reliances for its preservation. What was the course of my friend upon this subject of the Wilmot Proviso? He voted for it, and he could go back and say to his constituents, as all of you could go back and say to your constituents, if you chose to do so—"We wanted the Wilmot Proviso in the bill, we tried to get it in, but the majority of the Senate was against it. The question then came up whether we should lose California which has got an interdiction in her Constitution, which in point of value and duration is worth a thousand Wilmot's Provisos—we were reduced, as my honorable friend would say, to take the bill and the whole of it together, although we were disappointed in our votes with respect to the Wilmot Proviso, to take whatsoever of objectionable matter it may have in it, on account of the superior amount of good it contains."

It is said, Mr. President, that this "Omnibus," as it is called, contains too much. I thank, from the bottom of my heart, the enemy of the bill who gave it that denomination. The Omnibus is the vehicle of the people, and *this* bill deserves the name for another reason; that with the exception of two bills which are to follow, it contains all that is necessary to give peace and quiet to this country. It is said sometimes however, that this Omnibus is too heavily freighted, and that it contains incongruous matter. I shall not repeat the arguments which I have addressed to you heretofore, showing that, according to the British Parliamentary law, but especially according to the Congressional law, this bill is in conformity with practice in innumerable instances. But the ostensible objection that it contains too much matter is not the real one. Do you believe that the Senator who sits before me (Mr. Baldwin) and other Senators in this neighborhood, if you would attach to the Territorial Bill the Wilmot Proviso would have seen the incongruity? Would not the Senator, even, from Massachusetts (Mr. Davis) have voted for the whole of this incongruous bill with pleasure if it had only contained the Wilmot Proviso? It is not that the bill has too much in it; it has too little, according to the wishes of its opponents; and I am very sorry that the Omnibus cannot contain Mr. Wilmot, whose weight would break it down, I am afraid, if he were put here. [Laughter.] This incongruous measure, which has already too much in it, has not enough for the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Bell). He wants to put into it two or three or more States from Texas, provisionally upon the event of their becoming applicants for admission into the Union. No, Sir: it is not the variety of the matter, it is not the incongruity, the incompatibility of the measures of the bill, but it is because the bill does not contain enough to satisfy those who want the "Wilmot," as it has been properly called, placed in the Omnibus.

Why, Mr. President, incongruous as it may be supposed, this measure has not half the incongruity of the elements of opposition to this bill. While upon this part of my subject, allow me to answer an argument delivered with all the triumph of conscious victory by the Hon. Senator near me (Mr. Hale) the other day. He said he had gone into a certain apartment in this Capitol and there he had found my honorable friend from Michigan (Mr. Cass) and myself in close conversation; and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Foote) in consultation with a Senator now no longer in this place, but a Senator called by a grateful country to a more responsible station, and who has left us only this morning (Mr. Webster). I might have inquired how the Hon. Senator came there. May I ask to what key hole he applied his ear or his eye; in what curtain he was ensconced to hear and perceive that astonishing circumstance which he vaunted with so much complacency and self-satisfaction—[laughter]. Sir, I have been in repeated consultations with my friend (Mr. Cass) for so I will call him, and he has shown himself to be the friend of the peace of his country during the progress of this measure. Repeatedly have I been in consultation with him and other Democratic friends upon the subject of this bill, and the amendments which have been proposed. I regret only that our consultations have not been more numerous and of longer duration. But, sir, how stands the matter with them, with the elements of opposition to this bill? On the subject of Slavery, the treatment of California, the Territories, the adjustment of the boundary of Texas, the fugitive slave bill, and the bill for abolishing the slave trade, there is no difference of opinion between my Democratic friends whom I have consulted and myself; but there has been perfect union during all our consultations. Allow me to say that there is not a solitary instance in which a subject connected with party politics upon which we might have heretofore differed in the progress of the administration of our Government, has been adverted to. We spoke of that measure, which absorbed all our thoughts, which engrossed all our hopes, which animated all our anxieties—the subject of pacifying, if possible, the distracted parts of this country—a subject upon which there was between us a perfect coincidence of opinion.

But how does the matter stand with the extremes who united against this measure? Why, sir, they are extremes upon this very measure, and upon this very subject of Slavery! Upon the very subject under consideration there is among them no union of sentiment, no coincidence of opinion. In our meetings upon this subject, in our consultations, Democrats and Whigs convened and consulted together. They threw aside, as not genuine and as unworthy of their consideration, all the agitating politics of the day; and I venture to say that in these meetings between my Democratic friends and myself, there was no diversity or contrariety of opinion upon the only subject that brought us together. If I am not utterly mistaken, there is no such union and coincidence of opinion between the opponents of this bill, who, upon the very subject of Slavery to which it relates, are as wide apart as the north and south poles. Some of the opponents of this bill have had quite as pregnant consultations as its friends.—Whether the Senator near me from N. H. (Mr. Hale) was present or not, I am not able to say. I do not recollect to have heard that he was one of them, but I——

Mr. BUTLER [interposing]—I hope that the Senator——

Mr. PRESIDENT—Does the Senator from Kentucky yield the floor?

Mr. CLAY—No, sir, unless it is for an explanation.

Mr. BUTLER—I only wish to know of one meeting of the particular kind alluded to, or caucus, or anything of that sort, where these incongruous elements have met together.

Mr. CLAY [resumed]: I was going to exonerate you from the association, and I only wish I could separate you upon the final vote. [Laughter.] I am afraid we shall find you then together. Whose eyes have not witnessed the consultations between the extremes of this Chamber from day to day?—The eyes of every discerning Senator must have noticed it. But whether in the consultation between these ultra gentlemen of the South, there was any mixture of the abolition element who is near me, or not, I was about to remark that I do not say. I have not heard, indeed, that the Senator from N. H. (Mr. Hale) was present. But if he was absent, and these others about to vote upon the final question with some of our friends upon the other side, there is no doubt of the fact, from what I have learned, that the consultation of some of the opponents of the bill were quite as pregnant as any which have taken place between the friends of the bill.

Mr. DAYTON [interposing]—I dislike to interrupt the Senator, but I desire as one of the opponents of this bill, on this side of the Chamber, to disclaim all knowledge either direct or indirect, of any such meeting for consultation on this subject.

Mr. CLAY—Does the Senator deny all consultations?

Mr. DAYTON—I have no knowledge of any.

Mr. CLAY—I alluded more particularly to some Senators whose consultations I have heard have been frequent, very frequent, but I do not assert it as a fact.

Mr. MASON—I would ask the Senator when he alludes to Southern Senators, of whom I am one, if he would be good enough to declare whether he ever heard or whether he has any reason to believe that Senators from the Southern States have met in consultation upon this bill with any Senator from the Free States.

Mr. CLAY—No, sir. I had not heard so—but at the same time I would ask the Senator from Virginia whether they have not had frequent consultations among themselves?

Mr. MASON—I will answer freely; there certainly have been frequent consultations between Senators from the Southern States upon questions involving the dignity, honor, and safety of the Southern States, involved as they conceived in the provisions of the bill.

Mr. CLAY—And so, undoubtedly, did *our* consultations relate to the dignity, honor, and safety of the Union and the Constitution of our country. [Loud applause from the gallery.]

The PRESIDENT—Order. The sergeant at-arms will clear the gallery if order is not preserved. The Chair would not permit the applause to be repeated; if it is, he will be under the necessity of ordering all persons to leave the gallery.

Mr. CLAY—Mr. President, there is neither incongruity in the freight nor in the passengers on board our Omnibus. We are all heartily concurrent upon the only topic which brought us together, and which constitutes the sole subject of our consultations. We have no Africans nor Abolitionists in our Omnibus—no Jew nor Gentile, Disunionists nor Free-Soilers. Our passengers consist of Democrats and Whigs, who, seeing the crisis of their common country, and the dangers impending over it, have met together, forgetting and throwing far behind them their political differences upon other subjects, to compare their opinions upon this great measure of reconciliation and harmony.

Mr. President, how stand the questions which have formed the subjects of our deliberations so long? One party wants the immediate admission of California, and wants the imposition of the Proviso in the Territorial Governments. The other party wants the limits of California circumvented, and the Missouri Compromise line applied; some of them with the express recognition of the right to carry slaves south of it; others, again, without such a recognition, trusting to an implied constitutional right; and these other parties are strenuously opposed to the Proviso. Some again want the Texas Boundary settled; and others want it to be left open. These are the conflicting opinions which we recognize in this body. How are they to be adjusted? Is there a Senator, or a Member of the House—is there a man in this wide country—who will say that Congress ought to adjourn without settling these questions? Not one. How are these conflicting opinions to be adjusted, then?—Can it be otherwise done than by meeting in the spirit of amity and conciliation, and recollecting the great interests to be preserved and promoted by combination? The honorable Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Davis) says there are no parties who can make a compromise. Will the Senator excuse me for saying that this remark smells too much of the technicality of Blackstone. No parties! Are there not great conflicting interests, conflicting opinions, pervading the whole country? Who are the parties in that greatest of all compromises—the Constitution of the United States? There were no technical parties to that instrument, but in deliberating upon what was best for the country, and preserving that, there were great and conflicting interests pervading all its parts. They compromised and settled them by ample concessions and in the spirit of true patriotic amity. They adjusted these conflicting opinions; and the Constitution under which we sit at this moment is the work of their hands—a great, a memorable, magnificent compromise, which indicates to us the course of duty where differences arise, which can only be settled by the spirit of mutual concession. Sir, do we not know, and have we not reason to apprehend, that without a combined measure you can do nothing! I have heard, Mr. President, that a different temper prevails at this time: that it is possible to carry these measures if they are presented in succession, just as they have been reported by the Committee. I take the occasion to say, and am sure I express the sentiment of every Member of the Committee, that we are not prompted by the pride of opinion, nor wedded to any given system of arrangement or settlement of these great national questions. We preferred combining them in one measure, because we thought it most practical and most likely to lead to an auspicious result. But if it cannot be adopted in the conjoint form reported by the Committee, and if the desired object can be better attained by action upon a series of successive measures, without the odious Proviso, not a murmur of complaint, I am quite sure, will ever be heard from a single member of the Committee. It is not the means, it is the great specific end we have in view; and however that end is attained—whether by such an arrangement as this Committee has proposed, or by separate acts of legislation, the Committee and myself are utterly indifferent. But it is known to you that if all the measures comprised in the bill under consideration are not passed, there is danger that in the presentation of these measures in detail, some of them would fail, and the result would be that while one party got what it immediately wanted, the other would obtain nothing which it desired. You know there was great cause to apprehend—I hope there may be none now—that in the separate presentation of the measures, the consequence would be the attachment of the Wilmot Proviso in one or other of the two Houses, and the utter failure to establish any Territorial Government for Utah and New Mexico. It was thought then, in the spirit of our Revolutionary sires—in the spirit which has heretofore pervaded all our Government, conciliating and reconciling as much as possible opposing and conflicting interests and opinions—we would present a measure which would bind all, and that would lead both parties, so far as practicable, to unite upon it for the sake of harmony and tranquility. We thought then, as I think now, that Senators from the Northern States might go home to their constitutents after this measure shall have been passed, and say, "We have got California; she is secure; there is a prohibition of Slavery in her Constitution that will last perhaps forever, whereas the Wilmot Proviso would have had a limited and an evanescent duration—existing while the Territorial form of Government remained, but ending whenever the State should come to form for herself a Constitution." This our Northern Senators might say with great propriety to their constituents, "We have secured California for you; she is dedicated now and forever to that Free-Soilism which you so much prize." "Well, but why then," they might reply, "have you not put in a restriction in the Territorial Bill so as to secure that at least until they come to be ripe enough to form State Governments for themselves?" Would it not be a satisfactory reply to them to say that in your opinion and in the opinion of a large portion of this Senate, the law of nature and of Nature's God excluded Slavery from these Territories, and that according to your opinion the *lex loci* of the land also excluded Slavery? Might you not further add with propriety, that you endeavored to reconcile the distracted and disunited portions of this great empire, and that no imposition or restriction was necessary to any object which you desired to attain, and in a spirit of conciliation, therefore, you forbore to vote against the final measure, because it secured so much of what the North wanted? Could you not say that you were not in danger of losing what you also wanted in respect to the residue of the country?

This subject has presented one of the most extraordinary political phenomena that I ever witnessed. Here is a United Senate, almost in favor of all the measures in detail—in favor of the admission of California; in favor of Territorial governments for Utah and New Mexico, with or without the Proviso; in favor of the settlement of the boundary with Texas; in favor of all these measures in detail, but opposed to them when they come to be presented unitedly to be acted on, admitting the validity of every item of the account, but when it comes to be footed up, denying, or unwilling to acknowledge, the justice of paying the aggregate. Sir, if the measures had been more incongruous than they are alleged to be, there has been ample time for a just conception of them—just as perfect an understanding of them as if they had been presented in successive details.

I wish again to make only a very few observations about this same Proviso. It has been argued, with an ability which requires no addition or attempt at addition from me, by the Senator from Massachusetts, who has just vacated his seat, that the Proviso is not in itself a principle, but a means to accomplish an end. And where, let me ask, exists the necessity of a Proviso? You have been told that the existence of African Slavery depends upon the character of the climate and of the soil. The nature of the soil of New Mexico forbids the expectation that Slavery will ever be planted there. Why, we all know that slave labor is applicable only to the great staples which constitute the subjects of our foreign

commerce—cotton, sugar, hemp, tobacco and rice. Slave labor has been found, according to American experience, to be utterly valueless, or, at least to a great extent, valueless, in those States where these staple articles are not cultivated. Does anybody pretend that the soil of New Mexico or Utah is adapted to the culture of these articles? Do we not all know that if it were adopted, and the climate and soil would allow of their being cultivated, the expense of transportation from New Mexico or Utah, either to the Pacific on one hand, or to the Gulf of Mexico or the Atlantic on the other, would be perhaps ten times the value at home of any of these articles? But the Hon. Senator from Massachusetts, (Mr. Davis) has found out a new object of temptation in respect to slaves in New Mexico. He has employed an expression which filled all of us with profound regret, on account of the dignity, the character of the Senator, and the high stations which he has occupied. He spoke of New Mexico being adapted to the *breeding* of slaves. He has had the good taste to omit that expression in his printed speech, and to substitute for it the "traffic" in slaves.

Mr. Davis, [in his seat] I believe I did not use that expression.

Mr. Clay—The Senator did employ it, for it was heard and noticed by more than myself.

Mr. Davis—One cannot always remember precisely the language he uses in the hurry of debate. I can only say I have no recollection of using the word "breeding" and I think, if the reporters' notes are preserved and referred to, the word will not there be found. I shall have the curiosity to look and see if it is so; but, according to the best of my recollection, I spoke of the capacity of the country for "traffic" in Slaves.

Mr. Clay—That is the language of the gentleman's speech as printed; but the word "breeding" was used by the gentleman, or I never heard a word of the speech. Several Senators took note of it, and we expressed how much we were shocked and surprised at it. It was one of the principal topics of the Senator's speech; to talk about the cotton power, the cotton interest, and the breeding of slaves. Now if the Senator had put it on the ground of a *lapsus lingua* from the heat of debate or the unguarded character of debate, I should not insist upon attributing it to him, but the expression was used by him and I remarked it; it was fixed on my memory, and very much did I regret that he made use of it. This talk, sir, about the cotton power, the lords of the loom and the breeding of slaves, will do for the bar rooms of cross-road taverns, but I never hoped or expected to hear upon the floor of the Senate such epithets applied to the great manufactures of the North or the cotton-growers of the South. I have struggled with the honorable Senator side by side, and I think he might have been disposed to do some little justice to those States which stood by the North in the great measure of Protection to American Industry. There were Maryland, Delaware, North Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, which have generally stood by the principle of Protection to Northern interests. And among the more Southern States, Georgia, I believe, from what I have seen of recent manifestations of opinion of her representatives, was always ready to come up to the support and protection of our own domestic interests. And does not the Senator know that it was not the South—the unaided South—(for what could the South do alone in prostrating the principle of Protection?)—but it was the North and the South combined—it was Pennsylvania unintentionally, and New York, and Indiana, and Illinois, and Maine, and New Hampshire, and other free States, that decided the memorable contest of '44, and, combined with portions of the South, repealed the act of '42 by the passage of the act of '46, and prostrated the principle of Protection? And although, as I have stated on a former occasion, the South may be said in some sense to have had the general sway in the political affairs of this country for a long term of years, and although the Presidential office has been filled for the most part with her citizens, perhaps it would be as near the truth of history to say that the North itself has governed the country through the South. And is the honorable Senator from Massachusetts sure that if the calamitous event of the dissolution of the Union were to take place, and the North exclusively had the power of passing upon the principle of Protection, it would be now established? Unquestionably, without the concurrence and support of the South, none of those great measures, which are charged to the account of Southern domination—the "slave power" or the cotton power, could have passed. Sir, if my honorable friend (for so I wish still to regard him) wishes ever to see a moderate tariff established in this country, which shall secure Protection, to some extent, he will not do it by throwing out taunts such as he had done toward the Southern portion of the country, in respect to the "cotton power," or slave-breeding interest. This charge upon the slaveholding States, of breeding slaves for market, is utterly false and groundless. No such purpose ever enters, I believe, into the mind of any slaveholder. He takes care of the slaves; he fosters them and treats them often with the tenderness of his own children. They multiply on his hands, he cannot find employment for them, and he is ultimately, but most reluctantly and painfully, compelled to part with some of them, because of the increase of numbers and the want of occupation. But to say that it is the purpose, design or object of the slaveholder to breed slaves as he would domestic animals for a foreign market, is untrue in fact, and unkind to be imputed or ever intimated by any one. And it is not by such reproachful epithets as "lords of the loom," "lords of the plantation," the "slave power," and the "money power," that this country is to be harmonized, especially when we are debating upon these great measures which are essential to its onward progress, and to its present and future prosperity.

Mr. President, it is one of the peculiar coincidences attending my present position, as I remarked on a former occasion, that I am generally called upon to vindicate the measures proposed in this bill against those whom we have regarded as its friends, as well as those who are considered as open, avowed opponents of the measure. I anticipated the other day, somewhat the argument which I beg leave barely to advert to now. I think, among our Southern friends two or three great errors are occasionally committed. They interpret the Constitution according to their judgment; they engraft their exposition upon it; and instead of listening to, or giving due weight to the opposite interpretation, to the conflicting exposition, which is as honestly believed by the opposite interpreters as they believe on their side, they proclaim their own exposition of the Constitution, and cry out "*All* we want is the Constitution." In the comparison and expression of opposite opinions, infallibility is not the lot of mortal man. It belongs only to Him who rules the destinies of the world, and for any section, or any set of gentlemen to rise up, and say—'the Constitution means so and so, and he who says otherwise violates the Constitution,' is in itself intolerant, and without that mutual forbearance and respect which is due to the conflicting opinions honestly entertained by all who are equally aiming to arrive at the truth. Now, I said the other day that the Wilmot Proviso, as proposed to be enacted by Congress and incorporated in the Territorial bills, was a question totally distinct from the insertion of the restriction in a constitution formed by a newly organized State.

It is the opinion of the opponents of the bill, and the opinion, too, of some of its friends—although it is not my own opinion—that the Constitution confers no authority upon Congress to impose a restriction upon the subject of Slavery in Territorial Governments. Very well; if Congress has no power to enforce such a restriction, and, nevertheless, does exercise such a power, it is usurpation, it is assumption of illegal authority, it is wrong in any view of the matter, a grievous and oppressive wrong. But when a State which is about to enter into the Union, and which is deliberating concerning a Constitution which is best adapted to promote her interests and happiness, chooses to consider whether she shall admit or exclude Slavery, and decides to exclude it, can such an exercise of authrity on the part of the State, a conceded power, be confounded with the unconstitutional exercise of it by Congress! Now, do not our Southern friends who oppose this bill upon the ground that there is an interdiction to the introduction of Slavery in the California Constitution, and that it is equivalent to an introduction exercised unlawfully by Congress according to their views—do they not mingle truth and falsehood, black and white, things totally dissimilar? It is of no consequence what effect the one or the other measure may produce. That is a different question. The question is one of power, and I say the exercise of such a power, which they regard as a usurpation by Congress, is totally distinct from the lawful exercise of a similar power, by a State forming for herself and her own government a Constitution; three years ago, two years ago, one year ago, one short year ago, the great complaint on the part of the slaveholding States of this Union was the apprehended infliction upon their interests of a restriction called the Wilmot Proviso. Well, we have met together; there has been a change of public opinion. a modification of public opinion, at the North. And allow me to say that, with regard to that most important portion of our Union, its north-western section, no man is more entitled to the honor and gratitude of this salutary change than the Hon. Senator in my eye (Mr. Cass) who represents Michigan. He came here with his hands tied and bound by a restriction, which gave him no other alternative than a violation of his conscientious convictions of duty, or a resignation of his seat into the hands of those who sent him here. Discussions have taken place in this house, in the country, in the press—they ran through the North, and Michigan, nobly released and united the hands of her Senators, and left them free to pursue their own best judgment to promote the interests of their country. And allow me to say, this is the feeling of all the North West. There is, indeed, one honorable Senator here (Mr. Dodge, of Wis.) whose grave and Roman-like deportment in this body has filled me with admiration throughout our entire session—a Senator covered with laurels by his military deeds in the field of battle; and, if he will allow me to address him, approaching as we both are to the close of life, I would say to him that there is nothing wanting to a consummation of his assignment to a more conspicuous position in the country's history—there is *nothing* wanting but to clap the climax of renown by contributing to carry triumphantly through, this important measure of conciliation.

Let me, for one moment, assuming the passage of the various measures which complete the system reported by the Committee of Thirteen,—let me see what will be the condition of the two sections of the Union. what has been gained and lost for each.—The North gains the admission of California as a Free State, and the high probability of New Mexico remaining or becoming Free Territory; avoids any introduction of Slavery by the authority of Congress; sees New Mexico detached from Texas with a high degree of probability—from the nature of the climate and the character of the soil, and from other circumstances—that New Mexico will ultimately become also a Free State; and secures the abolition of the Slave Trade in the District of Columbia. Are not these objects of sufficient magnitude to satisfy any moderate, rational Northern wishes? And what will the South gain? The South avoids the assertion by Congress of the dangerous principle, as they regard it, contained in the Wilmot Proviso; places beyond controversy 900 miles of the Territory of Texas on the Rio Grande now in dispute; gains an efficient Fugitive Slave bill, and silences the agitation in this District about the abolition of Slavery. Sir, it may happen, and I am not going to disguise my convictions as to the probalities of the fact that the South will get no Territory in New-Mexico, Utah, or California, adapted to Slave Labor, in which Slaves will be introduced. But that is not the fault of Congress. It is Congressional power, Congressional usurpation, Congressional assumption of an unlawful authority over the institution of Slavery, against which the South raises her voice in protestation. If she cannot get Slave Territory in California, New-Mexico, and Utah, whose fault is it? She cannot blame Congress, but must upbraid nature's law and nature's God.

In human affairs yet to be attained, there are four conditions under which they present themselves—the certain, the probable, the possible, and the impossible. The certain requires no effort; the possible may be accomplished by an indomitable will and energetic perseverence in pursuit of it. But as to that which is impossible and inevitable, philosophy, reason and religion, and all the guides which are given to us by the blessings of God, inculcate on us the duty of submission to His will, and resignation to his paramount authority. Now it is inevitable, in my opinion, that Southern Slavery is excluded from the possession of any portion of California, Utah, and probably New-Mexico. And if so, why contend for it? Now what is it that distracts the public mind? A mere abstraction. We look back with surppise and astonishment at the persecutions and punishments for witchcraft that some two hundred years since occurred in the States of Massachusetts and Connecticut. Two hundred years hence, if not much sooner, posterity will read the history of the present times, agitating and threatening the country as they do, with as much astonishment as we pore over the leaves of the historian, in which he recounts the witchcraft and the persecution and punishment of witches in former times. And why contend for carrying slaves to Utah and New-Mexico, when there is nothing upon which their labor can be employed—where nobody will take them? . Let me remind gentlemen, now, while upon this point of the subject—I mean those who are desirous for the greatest extension of the theatre of Slavery—of a danger, and a great and imminent danger which they are incurring. I venture a prediction—not likely to be fulfilled or decided, perhaps, in the course of the short remnant of my life—that if Texas includes all the territory now claimed by her—nay, I go farther, although this contingency I am about to state is less likely to happen by the curtailment of the boundary.—I venture to say that in some thirty, forty or fifty years there will be no Slave State in the limits of Texas at all. I venture to predict that the Northern population—the population upon the upper part of the Rio Grande and perhaps upon the lower Rio Grande, will in process of time greatly outnumber the population holding slaves upon the Gulf and the lower waters of Texas; and a majority will be found to be adverse to the continuance of Slavery, and it will either be abolished or its limits effectually circumcribed. This is no new opinion with me. I think that I gave the same in a letter which I wrote some six years ago from Raleigh, in the State of North Carolina. I said, that if two, three or four States were formed out of Texas, they would become Free States. And I say the probability is very great of all Texas becoming so, if all remains as she has claimed, including from the mouth of the Rio Grande to its source, or even limited by El Paso.

But whether it be great or small, it appears to me that it is the interest and duty, and should be the inclination of the South to look at facts and nature as they exist, and to reconcile themselves to that which is inevitable and impossible—to reconcile themselves to the fact that it is impossible—however desirable it may be in the opinion of any of them—to carry Slavery to the countries which I have described.

But, Mr President, in the supposition which I have made, as to what is gained by either section of the Union, in consequence of this arrangement of the common difficulties between them, is there anything of which the South can justly complain? The fault of Congress cannot be cited as depriving them of the opportunity of carrying their slaves there. The provisions of the bill are that the people are left free to do as they choose. There is, indeed, one provision which did not meet my approbation, and with which I would have been better satisfied if it had been left out—and that is the provision which does not permit the government of the Territories to establish or prohibit Slavery; but it was introduced at the instance of some Southern gentlemen; and another amendment was also introduced at their instance, which expressly provides that if any States from this territory shall come here with a Constitution admitting Slavery, that the fact of the provision for or against Slavery is to constitute no objection to her admission into the Union. Now what complaint can the South make if the whole scheme is carried out? The South gains a virtual abandonment of the Wilmot Proviso, avoids the assumption of a power dangerous to the institution of Slavery within the States, or the application of such power to Slavery without the States, and secures 900 miles of now disputed territory. It is quite unreasonable for any gentleman from the South or elsewhere to get up and say that the title of Texas to this country is indisputable—that it is as clear as the title of any other State to any other territory in the Union. There is an opposite opinion; and I share myself in the doubt of the validity of the claim of Texas from the mouth of the Rio Grande to the source of that stream. Here are opposite opinions, honestly and sincerely entertained by both parties. What is to be done in such a case? You refuse to appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. You disown any jurisdiction which can settle the question. Texas at this moment threatens, we understand, by force of arms, to enforce her claim upon New Mexico.

How is the question to be settled? Can it be done otherwise than by compromise, and by the Compromise proposed in this bill? I repeat, the South gets 900 miles of the best part of the country bordering upon the Rio Grande put out of the controversy as to the present right to transport slaves there. She gains the abandonment of the Wilmot Proviso, an extent of territory on the Rio Grande, and she gets a fugitive slave bill which I trust will be rendered efficient; and she also gets, as I trust I shall be able to show, in the progress of my argument, the abandonment of the agitation for the abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia. What more can the South ask? Congress does nothing to injure her; denies her no rights; has offered as much as it can: and says, that if any new State shall come here, it shall be admitted with or without Slavery, as its people shall choose. What more, let me ask, can the South demand?

Sir, I repeat, that if the South does not gain the sanction of her right to carry slaves into the new acquisitions, it is because, according to her own doctrine, Congress has no constitutional authority to confer such a privilege; and because California, exercising her undoubted power, has excluded Slavery from her limits: and because, in the limits of Utah and New Mexico, the laws of Nature and of Nature's God exclude Slavery. Now let me, at this point of the case, stop a moment to compare the system of measures recommended by the Committee, with what has been contended for by some of the Southern Senators during the progress of the bill—viz: the line of 36 deg. 30 min. to be run to the Pacific, to cut that much off, of course, from the State of California. Let us consider that question under two aspects: First, without a provision that slaves may be carried South of that line; and, secondly, with such a provision. If a line is run without a declaration as to its effects upon the one side or the other, you might as well run a line upon the sands, upon the ocean, or in the air; it would be obliterated with the first blast of wind or the first billow. I am aware that there are gentlemen who maintain that, in virtue of the Constitution, the right to carry slaves South of that line already exists, and that of course those who maintain that opinion want no other security for the transportation of their slaves south of that line, than the Constitution. If I had not heard that opinion avowed, I should have regarded it as one of the most extraordinary assumptions of power, and the most indefensible position that was ever taken by man. The Constitution neither created, nor does it continue Slavery. Slavery existed independent of the Constitution, and antecedent to the Constitution, and it was dependent on the States, not upon the will of Congress, but upon the law of the respective States. The Constitution is silent and passive upon the subject of the institution of Slavery; or rather it deals with the fact as a fact that exists, without having created, continued, or being responsible for it in the slightest degree, within the States. There are but three provisions in the Constitution which relate to the subject of Slavery. There is that which subjects slave property to taxation, that which makes a component part in the estimation of the population in fixing the ratio of representation, and that which provides for the recovery of fugitive slaves. That is the whole extent of the Constitutional provisions upon the subject of Slavery. It no more instituted Slavery, nor is responsible for its continuance or its protection for a moment while it remains within the bosom of the States, than it is responsible for the protection of any other personal property, depending for its protection upon the State and not upon Congressional law. Why, it is said that upon the high seas a vessel, of whose cargo slaves compose a part, would be under the protection of the Constitution and the Government of the United States. So it would be upon the Ocean—and why? Because there is no separate jurisdiction existing there, in any nation; but there is a common jurisdiction, common to all nations—and the flag which floats at the mast-head of the ship carries with it the laws of the nation to which the vessel belongs.

But the moment the vessel gets out of that jurisdiction, the moment it gets into a separate territorial jurisdiction, the flag and the ship and the cargo become subject to the territorial jurisdiction, and are no longer under the protection of the Constitution of the United States. Why, Sir, that is not only true of the Free States of this Union, but it is true of the Slave States. Thus, if a vessel leaves for the port of Charleston with a cargo of slaves and enters into the port of Boston or New York, the moment she weighs anchor within the harbor, the moment she comes within the territorial jurisdiction of the laws of Massachusetts or New York, those laws operate upon the slaves and determine their actual condition. I speak of course of the case in which they are voluntarily carried there. If they are carried there without the consent of the owner, they may of course be pursued under the provision of the Constitution which relates to fugitives. But if they are voluntarily carried, the instant they quit the wide ocean and come within the territorial jurisdiction, they are subject to the laws of that territorial jurisdiction.

If you were to carry a cargo of slaves into the port of Liverpool or Havre, does any man pretend that the flag of the United States would protect them, after they entered into the territorial jurisdiction of England or France? No such thing. Nor is it like the case which has often been cited in argument, of the slaves which were cast upon the Bahama Islands, which occurred some years ago. That was involuntary loss of property consequent upon the act of God. I do think Great Britain was bound in comity, if not in strict justice, in that case, to surrender those slaves, or to make ample indemnity for them, and not to take advantage of an involuntary and inevitable misfortune But if slaves are carried into such a jurisdiction, their chains instantly drop off, and they become free, emancipated and liberated from their bondage.

But I have said that this is not only the general law, and the law applicable to the Free States of this Union, but it is the law of the Slave States themselves. The law in Louisiana is now repealed, but some years ago there was a law in that State which prevented the exportation of slaves from other States, and if then you had gone with a cargo of slaves into the port of New Orleans they would have become legally free or the owner would have become subjected to a heavy penalty, according to the enactment of that State. And there is at this time, if I am not mistaken, a law in Mississippi which is not repealed, (one of the Senators from Mississippi will inform you if I am wrong:) which forbids the introduction of slaves as merchandise, and if you carry from Kentucky or Tennessee, a steamboat load of slaves, you lose your property. I believe that in the case of Mississippi, the slave does not become free, but that the party who imports him is subjected to heavy pecuniary penalty. Such is the state of the law, I believe, at this time, in the State of Virginia. It is, therefore, not only true of other foreign nations, but it is true of the States composing this Union, that the moment a slave enters the territorial jurisdiction of the State or foreign country, the laws of the place determine his condition, and not the laws nor the flag of the ship in which he is transported there. On the ocean the flag determines the jurisdiction for the reasons I have assigned, but the moment they come within the separate jurisdiction of any State or country, that moment they become amenable to, and are liable to be dealt with according to the laws of that country. If the Constitution possesses the paramount authority attributed to it, the laws of even the free States of the Union would yield to that paramount authority. If, therefore, it be true that, according to the laws now in force in California, New Mexico and Utah, Slavery cannot be introduced—if such is the *lex loci*—the Constitution of the United States is as passive and neutral upon the subject as the Constitution or Government of any country upon earth. It protects wherever upon the high seas the slave is out of the separate jurisdiction of any State, foreign or domestic. It affords no protection when it comes within the scope and jurisdiction of laws which forbid the existence of Slavery. I do not mean to go into a long argument upon this subject. I did intend at one time to take it up and discuss it very fully. I have thought it best, however, under all the circumstances of the case, merely to express these brief opinions which I entertain in relation to it. In my opinion, therefore, the supposition that the Constitution of the United States carries Slavery into California, supposing her not to be a State, is an assumption totally unwarranted by the Constitution. Why, if the Constitution gave the privilege, it would be incompetent for Calfornia to adopt the provisions which she has in her Constitution. The Constitution of the United States, being supreme, no State could pass an enactment in contravention of the Constitution. My rules of interpreting the Constitution of the United States are the good rules of '98 '99. I have never in my life deviated from those rules, and what are they? The Constitution is an aggregate of ceded powers. No power is granted, except when it is expressly delegated, or when it is necessary and proper to carry into effect a delegated power; and if in any instance the power to carry slaves into the Territories is guarantied to you by the Constitution, or is an incident necessary to the carrying out of any other power that is delegated in the Constitution, I have been unable to perceive it amid all the vicissitudes of public life, and amid all the changes and turns of party. I never in my life have deviated from these great fundamental and I think indisputably true principles of interpreting the Constitution of the United States. Take these principles to be true, and where is the power? Can anybody point it out to me? What gives you a right to carry your slaves to California? Where is the delegated power, or the power to which it attaches as necessary implication? It is nowhere to be found. You must resort to some such general principle as the Federalists did in the early history of this country, when they contended for the doctrine of general welfare. But you cannot put your finger upon that part of the Constitution which conveys the right or the power to carry slaves from one of the States of the Union to any Territory of the United States. Mr. President, you will remark that I am expressing an opinion upon the power, the constitutional right. I do not go into the question of how the powers of Government are to be exercised or applied in the course of administration. That is a distinct question. I am arguing the question of Constitutional power. Nor, Sir, can I admit for a single moment, that there is any separate or distinct right upon the part of States or individual members of the Union, or any portion of the people of the United States, to carry slaves into the Territories, under the idea that those Territories are held in common between the several States.

It is a joint property, held by a common trustee, for the general good, and to be administered by the general government according to its deliberate judgment of what will best promote the common happiness and prosperity, and do justice to all. If, therefore, I am right in these opinions which I have expressed, to run a line at 35 deg., or 36 deg. 30 min. through California, without declaring what the effect of that line shall be either South or North of it, it would, I repeat, he running a line in the sand—a line without motive, without purpose, without accomplishing any end whatever—Therefore, I must say, that those Senators upon the other side, who have contended for an express recognition of the right to carry slaves South of that line, have contended for something much more perfect and efficient than to run a marked line without any such declaration. But there are two considerations which oppose insuperable objections to any such recognition or declaration to carry slaves South of that line. The first is that you cannot do it without an assumption of power upon the part of Congress to act upon the institution of Slavery; and if they have the power in one way, they have the power to act upon it the other way, and the power to act upon it either way is what you have denied, opposed and endeavored to prevent being accomplished for the last two or three years. It would be an assumption, according to the Southern doctrine, for Congress to exercise any power either side of a given line. The other objection to accomplishing the object is that it is impracticable and unattainable. A majority neither of this body nor of the House, not one third probably of this body, and perhaps still a smaller portion of the other House, could be got to affirm any right of transporting slaves North of 36 deg. 30 min. It is then wrong in principle and impracticable and inexpedient.

Why, then, contend, let me ask, for a line which, if attainable at all, is attainable without value, without necessity, without advantage to the South, or why attempt that which is utterly unattainable,—a line which shall secure an express provision for the power or right on the part of the slaveholder to carry his slaves south of it?

Having endeavored to show that this measure which we have under consideration is better for the South than the line of 36 30, let me compare the measure in a few brief words with the other one which has been under consideration by us (heretofore). The other measure proposes to admit California forthwith, and New Mexico as soon as she presents a Constitution, and Utah to follow on, some time after New Mexico is admitted, all to be permitted to decide the question for themselves, without any intervention of the power or authority of Congress.

Well, what advantage is that to the South? You know, for I believe it has been already done by the Constitution of New Mexico as well as by that of California, that Slavery will be prohibited! You know that if New Mexico comes in, she comes in like California, with an interdiction of Slavery. What do you get then? what advantage to the South? Sir, it is a one-sided measure—the measure which I am considering. It is all North, and looks not at all towards Southern interests. It is liable to the objection which I have already stated upon a former occasion, and which it is not necessary that I should repeat now. But if you admit New Mexico with the boundary between her and Texas unadjusted, what may the consequence be? You admit a people and territory who, if Texas shall establish her claim to the whole extent of the Eastern border of the Rio Grande, may be cut off by the subsequent action of Texas or of the Supreme Court of the United States. You admit the State of New Mexico, afterward to be cut in two, and a State left in the Union without territory and without people; for I will state what is well known, I dare say, to other Senators, that all the people who can constitute any ground or color of claim for the admission of New Mexico into the Union, as a State, are upon the east side of the Rio Grande, and all the territory worth having is upon the same side of that river. Then it happens, if the plan presented for the admission of these States be adopted and carried, you take California absolutely with all her present limits, and New Mexico in such a way that it may happen that you will have a State in the Union without territory and without people. Texas, by the assertion and successful prosecution of her claims, will have taken all the territory and all the people that would have constituted any ground for the admission of the State of New Mexico.

Mr. President: I approach now the question of what the consequences must be of the defeat of the measure now before the Senate, and what the consequences will probably be in case of the unsuccessful support of the measures by Congress. If the bill is defeated and no equivalent measures be passed, as in all human probability will be the case if this measure is not passed, and we go home—in what condition do we leave this free and glorious people?

In regard to Texas, there is danger, as I have remarked, of two civil wars. There is danger, in the first place, of the resistance of the people of New Mexico to the authority of Texas, supposing non-interference on the part of the General Government. But if New Mexico goes on to organize herself into a State government, and insists upon the exercise of the powers which appertain to State sovereignty, we must shut our eyes, and be blind to passing events, if we do not see that there is danger of a servile civil war originating between Texas, and, if you please, the troops of the United States that may come in aid of New Mexico. Assuming that Texas will move with military array upon New Mexico, there will probably be resistance upon the part of the General Government to the entry of the troops of Texas into the limits of New Mexico, although there may be uncertainty as to the course upon this subject, which will be taken by the Administration just coming into power, upon which we have the advantage of no light whatever. But we know that the admistration which has just passed out of power, would, in that contingency, have repelled the attack made by Texas. If the present Administration should feel it incumbent upon itself to repel such an invasion, the consequences which I am to portray are at least possible if not likely to occur. I am not going to magnify the power of Texas. I am not going to magnify the power of any single State. It is with infinite regret, with profound sorrow and surprise, that I hear individual States talking as they occasionally do. Why, sir, it was only the other day that a member, returned from the Nashville Convention, addressed, we are told, the people of Charleston, S. C. I do not know which most to admire, the gravity and possible consequences which may ensue from carrying out the views of the Delegates to the Nashville Convention, or the ridiculous scenes which occurred during the course of the public meeting. He was applauded most enthusiastically, as I learned from the public papers, and as I learned also from a credible gentleman who was present at the meeting, when he declared that if the South did not join herself to the standard of rebellion, South Carolina would herself rise and fight this Union singly and alone.—"Yes," said a gentleman in the audience, in a fit of most patriotic enthusiasm, "I, with my strong arm and my long purse, will fight the Union myself, if South Carolina does not."

Mr. President, I have no patience for hearing this bravado, come from what source it may. At the same time I am not disposed to undervalue its importance as one of many contemporaneous events.

There are great interests in this country which are contagious—sympathetic. If the contest were alone between Texas and the United States, I think there would be some little probability that the United States might not come off second best in such a contest with Texas. It is possible that the twenty-nine other States of the Union might repel an invasion of Texas upon New Mexico, if every other country stood aloof and left the two parties (the United States and Texas) to fight out the contest. I think there is some probability that with the gallant individual now in my eye (General Scott) in command of our armies, who has already so signalized the glory of his country and himself, we might not come off second best in a contest with Texas alone. But, sir, Texas will not be alone it a war breaks out between her and the troops of the United States on the upper Rio Grande There are ardent, enthusiastic spirits of Arkansas, Missouri, Louisiana, and Alabama, that will flock to the standard of Texas, contending, as they believe they will be contending, for slave territory. And they will be drawn on State by State, in all human probability, from the banks of the Rio Grande to the banks of that stream which flows by the tomb of Washington. I do not say that this will happen; but I say there is danger it may happen. If there should be a war even of all the Southern States with the residue of the Union, I am not going to say that in such a contest—such a fratricidal contest,—the Union itself, the residue of the Union, might not prove an over-match for Southern resistance. I will not assert which party would prevail in such a contest, for you know, sir, what all history teaches, that the end of war is never seen in the beginning of war; and that few wars which mankind have waged among themselves have ever terminated in the accomplishment of the objects for which they were commenced. There are two descriptions of ties which bind this Union and the glorious People together. One is the political bond and tie which connects them. The other is the fraternal and commercial tie which binds them together. I want to see both preserved. I wish never to see the day when the ties of commerce and fraternity shall be destroyed, and the iron bands afforded by political connections shall alone exist and keep us together. And when you take into view the firm conviction which Texas has of her undoubted right, when we know at this moment that her Legislature is about to convene, and before Autumn arrives troops may be on their march from Texas to take possession of the disputed territory of New Mexico, which she believes to belong to herself,—is there not danger which should make us pause and reflect before we leave this Capitol without providing against such a perilous emergency? Let blood be once spilled in the conflict between the troops of Texas and those of the United States, and my word for it, thousands of gallant men will fly from the States I have enumerated, if not from all the slave States, to sustain and succor the power of Texas, and to preserve her in possession of that in which they, as well as she, feel so deep an interest. Even from Missouri, because her valiant population might most quickly pour down upon Santa Fe, and render assistance to Texas; even from Missouri, herself a slave State, it is not at all unlikely that thousands might flock to the standard of the weaker party, and assist Texas in her struggles. Is that a state of things which you Senators can contemplate without apprehension? Or can you content yourselves with going home and leaving it to be possibly realized before the termination of the current year? Are you not bound as men, as patriots, as enlightened statesmen, to provide for the contingency? And how can you provide for it better than by this bill, which separates a reluctant people about to be united to Texas—a people who themselves, perhaps, will raise the standard of resistance against the power of Texas, which separates them from Texas, and guards them against the possibility of a sympathetic and contagious war, springing up between the Slave States and the power of the General Government, which I regard as almost inevitable, if Congress adjourns with the admission of California alone, stopping there, and doing nothing else. For, sir, the admission of California alone, under all the circumstances of the time, with the Proviso still suspended over the heads of the South, with the abolition of Slavery still threatened in the District of Columbia—the act of the admission of California, without provision for the settlement of the Texas boundary question, without the other portions of this bill, will aggravate, and embitter, and enrage the South, and make them rush on furiously and blindly, animated as they believe, by a patriotic zeal, to defend themselves against Northern aggression. I call upon you then, sir, I call upon the Senate—in the name of the country—never to separate from this Capitol without settling all the questions, leaving nothing to disturb the general peace and repose of the country.

Mr. President—I have hitherto argued upon the contingency of nothing being done but the simple admission of California. Now let me argue upon the contingency of the passage of this bill. What will be its leading effects?—what its reconciling consequences? The Hon. Senator who usually sits before me. (Mr. Hale) has told us more than once that if you pass this bill, you do not hush agitation—that you even increase it, that it will become more violent than ever. With regard to that Senator, while I detest his abolition principles, I admire his manly, pleasant, convivial and personal qualities—his good humor, his power of ready debate, the promptness with which he can carry on a guerrilla fight in the Senate. I will not say that the Senator from New Hampshire does not believe what he says; respect for the decorum of debate will prevent me from saying that. But, Mr. President, do you believe that the Abolitionists conceive that more agitation will spring out of this measure than exists now? They live by agitation! It is their meat; their bread; the air which they breathe; and if they saw in its incipient stage a measure giving them more of that food and meat and bread and air, do you believe that they would oppose themselves to its adoption? Do you not believe that they would *hail* [Hale] it as a blessing? [Great laughter.] Why, Mr. President, how stands the fact? There is not an Abolitionist in the United States that I know of—there may be some—there is not an Abolition press, if you begin with that located in Washington, and embrace all others—there is not one Abolitionist in this Senate who is not opposed to this bill—not one of them in this chamber nor out of it any where, that is not opposed to the adoption of this Compromise plan. And why are they opposed to it? They see their doom as certain as there is a God in Heaven, who sends His providential dispensations to calm the threatening storm and tranquilize agitated man. As certain as that God exists in Heaven [turning toward Mr. Hale] your business, your avocation is gone! I argue much more from acts, from instinctive feelings, from the promptings of the heart, from a conscious apprehension of impending ruin to the cause which they espouse, than I do from the declamatory and eloquent language which they employ in resistance to this measure. What! increase agitation, and the agitators against the plan? It is an absurdity!

Let us now take up the measures in detail, and see how there could be greater agitation after the adoption of this general system of Compromise, than without its adoption. Let us begin and go over the whole five measures if you please. There is California—She is admitted into the Union;—will they agitate about that? Well, there are the Territorial Governments established,—will they agitate about them? There is the settlement of the Texas boundary question;—upon what can they agitate? About the settlement of that boundary? They have every probability—I own it frankly to my Southern friends—not resulting from the settlement of the boundary, but from the nature and character of the country—of having that also dedicated to Free Soil; will they agitate about that? Then will they agitate about the slave trade in the District of Columbia? That is accomplished. Then, what can they agitate about, supposing the whole system of measures to be carried out. They might agitate a little about not getting the Proviso fastened upon the bill—might agitate a little about not getting the abolition of Slavery itself in the District of Columbia. The Senator behind me (Mr. Seward) has estimated the number of slaves here at a thousand. I think he is mistaken, and that it is a little more than that. What in the name of Heaven will they agitate about, if these five measures are carried? When will they agitate?—Who will be their auditory in their agitation?—Here is a scheme of National reconciliation, a scheme or system which brings into fraternal harmony those whose hands were about to be raised against each other as enemies—a system to which the whole country becomes reconciled. What will they agitate about? Where will they get followers and disciples? There is a portion of them—I speak not of the Free Soilers—I speak not of those who from principle are honestly opposed to extension of Slavery; but of that fanatic, desperate band, who call themselves I don't know what—Liberty men, or something of the kind—but there are those who have declared that this Union ought not to exist—those who would strike down the pillars upon which stands the most glorious edifice that ever was erected by the arm of man—self-government; and that would crush amid the ruins of the fall all this people and all the hopes and expectations of ourselves and mankind. Men who would go into the temples of their Holy God and drag from their sacred posts the ministers who are preaching His Gospel for the comfort of mankind and their salvation, and burn the temples themselves—*they* might agitate. Men who, if their power was equal to their malignity, would seize the sun of this great system of ours, drag it from the position in which it keeps in order the whole planetary system of the universe—they, perhaps, might agitate. But the great body of the people of the United States will acquiesce in this adjustment, will be reconciled to this settlement by their common Representatives, after near nine months of an anxious and arduous struggle. The great body of the people of the United States will be satisfied, and will acquiesce in this great settlement of our national trials and difficulties, in this, the most momentous crisis that has ever existed in our national history. No, sir; they may threaten agitation; they may talk of it here and elsewhere; but their occupation is gone They will be stigmatized, and justly stigmatized, as unworthy disturbers of the peace, if they attempt longer to prolong the dissensions and distractions of this country, after we have settled, and so well settled, so many questions which have divided us.

But, Mr. President, I am not only fortified in my convictions that this would be the salutary and healing effect of this great plan of compromise and settlement of our difficulties; but I am supported by the nature of man and the truth of history. What is this nature? Why, sir, after perturbing storms a calm is sure to follow. The nation wants repose. It pants for repose, and entreats you to give it peace and tranquility. Do you believe when the nation's Senators, and the nation's Representatives, after such continued struggle as we have had, shall settle these questions, it is possible for the most malignant of all men longer to distrust the peace, the quiet, and harmony of this otherwise most prosperous country?

But I said not only according to the nature of man, but according to the universal desire which prevails throughout this wide spread land, would the acceptance of this measure lead to a joy and exultation almost unexampled in our history. I refer to historical instances occurring in our own Government to verify me in the conviction I entertain of the healing and tranquilizing consequences which will result from the adoption of this measure. What was said when the Missouri Compromise was passed?

Then, as now, when it was approaching its passage, when being perfected, it was said, "It will not quell the storm, nor give peace to the country." How was it received when it passed? The bells rang, the cannons were fired, and every demonstration of joy throughout the whole land, was made upon the settlement of the Missouri Compromise. Nor is it true, as has been unkindly suggested, that Northern men were obliged to remain at home and incur the displeasure of their constituents. There was Henry Baldwin of Pittsburgh, Henry R. Storrs of New York, and others, if I had time to enumerate them, who voted for the settlement of the Missouri question, and who retained the confidence and affection of their respective constituencies. I suppose the Senator was understood—as I understood him—to throw out something by way of menace to Northern Senators, to make them swerve from the patriotic duty which lies before them of healing the agitation of the country. They did not lose the confidence of their country. They may have in particular instances; but I speak of those of whom I have a distinct recollection. Yes, sir, the Missouri Compromise was received with exultation and joy. Not the reception of the Treaty of Peace, negotiated at Ghent, nor any other event which has occurred during my progress in public life, ever gave such unbounded and universal satisfaction as the settlement of the Missouri Compromise. We may argue from like causes—like effects.—Then, indeed, there was great excitement—then, indeed, all the Legislatures of the North called out for the exclusion of Missouri; and all the Legislatures of the South called out for her admission as a State. Then, as now, the country was agitated like the ocean in the midst of a turbulent storm. But, now, more than then, has this agitation been increased—now, more than then, are there dangers which exists; and if the controversy remains unsettled, more aggravated, and more to be dreaded. The idea of disunion then was scarcely a low whisper. Now, it has become a familiar language in certain portions of the country. The public mind and the public heart are becoming familiarized with that most dangerous and fatal of all events, the disunion of the States. People begin to contend that this is not so bad a thing as they supposed. Like the progress in all human events, as we approach danger it disappears; it diminishes in our conception, and we no longer regard it with the awful apprehension of consequences that we did before we came in contact with it. Everywhere, now, there is a state of things, a degree of alarm and apprehension and determination to fight, as they regard it, against the aggressions of the North, that did not so demonstrate itself at the period of the Missouri Compromise. It was followed in consequence of the adoption of the measure which settled the difficulty of Missouri, by peace, harmony, and tranquility. So, now I infer from the greater amount of danger, that if you adopt the measures under consideration, they too, will be followed by the same amount of contentment, satis

ism,—the victory of discord and agitation over peace and tranquility;—and I pray Almighty God, that it may not, in consequence of this inauspicious result, lead to the most unhappy and disastrous consequences to our beloved country. [Applause.]

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

Without Concealment---Without Compromise.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, AUGUST 8, 1850.

ANNIVERSARY OF BRITISH WEST INDIA EMANCIPATION.

The Sixteenth Anniversary of that glorious day, when Eight Hundred Thousand of our fellow-beings in the West India islands were lifted from a degraded state of chattel Slavery to Freedom, manhood, and a participation in the rights and blessings which God designed for all, was celebrated by the MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, in the City of Worcester.

Every preparation had been made for a large and efficient meeting; and, notwithstanding the rain of the early morning, and the prospect of its continuance through the day, a large, harmonious, and (as we have reason to believe) a very effective meeting was the result.

The spacious City Hall was well filled at the hour of 10 o'clock, A. M.; and, soon after, the meeting was called to order by FRANCIS JACKSON, of Boston, the President of the Massachusetts A. S. Society.

On motion, Samuel May, Jr., Joshua T. Everett, and Cyrus M. Burleigh, were chosen a Committee to report upon the organization of the meeting. This Committee recommended that the meeting be organized by the appointment of the following officers:

For President,

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, of Boston.

Vice Presidents.

Edmund Quincy,	of	Dedham;
Francis Jackson,	"	Boston;
Effingham L. Capron,	"	Worcester;
George S. Flint,	"	Rutland;
E. D. Draper,	"	Milford;
Alfred Wyman,	"	Westminster;
James B. Whitcomb,	"	Brooklyn, Ct.

Secretaries.

Samuel May, Jr.	of	Leicester;
Benjamin Snow, Jr.,	"	Fitchburg.

Committee on Finance.

Joshua T. Everett,	of	Princeton;
James N. Buffum,	"	Lynn;
Lewis Ford,	"	Abington;
Nathaniel B. Spooner,	"	Plymouth;
Martin Stowell,	"	Worcester.

The report was accepted, and the persons therein named duly elected.

Mr. GARRISON, on taking the chair, made some introductory remarks touching the anniversary we have come together to celebrate. He spoke of that sublime act of national justice, the gift of freedom to near one million human beings. It was a peaceful event. None of the predicted disorder and violence ensued. No master's blood was shed, no plantation destroyed, no acts of violence or preying one upon another. Where now are those prophets who prophecied so falsely?

The first hymn on the printed sheet was then sung in full chorus:

"Our grateful hearts with joy o'erflow."

S. MAY, Jr., after some explanatory remarks concerning the Railroad accommodations for persons attending this meeting, read a letter addressed to the meeting by twenty-seven gentlemen, ministers, church officers and members, in the towns of Saybrook and Windham, Conn., expressive of their interest in the occasion, and delegating one of their number, Rev. Ezekiel Rich, to attend as their representative. Mr. MAY then proceeded to speak of the condition of things at present found in Jamaica and the other British West Indies, as learned from the oral statement of Mr Geo. W. Alexander, an English gentleman just returning from a seven months' tour of inspection in those islands. The account given by Mr. Alexander, a brief summary of which was laid before the meeting by Mr May, was very encouraging, and decidedly favorable in respect to the physical, moral and social condition of the emancipated slaves of those islands Our limits do not allow of a repetition of the facts presented. A full report of Mr. Alexander's visit will doubtless soon be published.

CHARLES C. BURLEIGH followed with a luminous and eloquent exposition of the practical working of West India emancipation, ably answered objections, and refuted the pro-slavery fallacies which have been so industriously circulated, and in an especial manner exposed the heartless policy recommended of late by Thomas Carlyle.

The second hymn was then sung, one of the Rev. J. Pierpont's:

"Where Britania's emerald isles
Gem the Carribean sea"——

The President then said it was to be remembered that it was *British* emancipation which we had met to-day to commemorate; he had great pleasure, therefore, in introducing to the meeting an English gentleman, who had kindly accepted an invitation to be present—one whose name would be an introduction for him here, and who, as an Englishman, had reason to be proud of the event celebrated to-day. He wished he could say it was *American* emancipation also that we celebrated. He then introduced the Rev. RUSSELL LANT CARPENTER, of Bristol, England, who was received with a hearty welcome.

Mr. CARPENTER said that if ever an Englishman had reason to rejoice in his native land, it was when he remembered the event of which this anniversary reminds us. He reviewed the successive steps by which West India emancipaion had been gained. At first, the demand was made for a *gradual* emancipation; it was thought the slaves should be prepared for freedom, and that they should be educated, in order that they should discharge properly the duties of freemen. And I too think, said Mr. C., that they ought to have been thus educated. But, then, who would do it? Who was there to educate and prepare them? Teachers were rebuffed; missionaries were insulted and driven off; and as for the masters, they had, unfortunately, but one instrument of education in their hands, to wit, the *lash* ["beneficent whip,' as Mr. Carlyle calls it].

I had my objections, said Mr. C., to the payment of the twenty millions pounds sterling [about $100,000,000] to the West India planters for the liberation of their slaves; but the practical men thought that, as Great Britain had so long protected and encouraged the West India proprietors in this kind of property, it was no more than fair that she should bear a share of the burdens incident to emancipation; and I am now glad it was paid. The planters should have been ashamed to take it. For why did they take it? Because, said they, we are all this and more the poorer for freeing the slaves. What was this reply of theirs but a full admission that they had before robbed these poor slaves of this amount!

Mr. C. then considered the complaint raised by the enemies of Emancipation, that the products of these islands had diminished since Slavery was abolished. In a strain of pleasant sarcasm he referred to the great moans about *sugar*, that we hear in certain quarters, the falling off of sugar, as if there was no possibility of living without sugar, and it were perfectly allowable to enslave any quantity of men in order to have sugar cheap. Many folks, said he, have got along in the world very well without sugar; the Pilgrim fathers, I think, had very little sugar. Mr. C. very happily enlarged on these points, and was warmly applauded as he added, "I have heard, to be sure, that Jamaica was not as well cultivated as it ought to be, but I have also heard that the negroes were not the laziest people in Jamaica."

I have, said he, a jealousy of *exports*. I remember, when a boy, seeing cargoes of pigs brought from Ireland and landed in Bristol. Was this a proof of the prosperity and abundance of Ireland, and that her population had enough and to spare? Was it a proof of a redundance of pigs in Ireland? or did it only shew that the Irish were too wretchedly poor to buy and consume their own bacon, and must therefore send it to those who could buy it? I feel deep shame when I hear this cry, both in England and America, of the diminished exports from these islands. I think of the *fourteen hours a day*, and often more, by the severe labor of which the exports were kept up, and I am ashamed of those who grudge every pound of sugar the less, and show no thought or care for the welfare of the laborer from whose toil it is exported.

I have not felt it my duty, said Mr C., to take an active part in your Anti-Slavery work, since I have been among you, on account of its political connections. But I can't pretend to be unmoved or indifferent. I have travelled throughout your land; I have observed not much perhaps, but a little; and I cannot be unmoved by what I have myself seen and heard among you. Your American citizens sometimes visit England, and very prone they are to bestow eulogies on the United States; they glorify the entire Union; they glory in every star and stripe of your Flag. But if, perchance, the fact of the Slavery of one-sixth part of their population is alluded to, then a change comes over them, and they say "Oh! you don't understand our Government, you don't understand our *peculiar* institutions; Slavery is a Southern matter exclusively, I assure you." But they had forgotten that, in their previous panegyrics on the Union. I have been at the South, as a visitor; they don't understand you; perhaps you don't understand them; I don't pretend to understand either of you. They told me that, notwithstanding the Northern outcry against Slavery, Northern men came South and bought and held slaves, and became the severest and most impatient masters. And they told me of the degraded condition in which the colored population was kept at the North. I was glad to tell them of many particulars in which their rights are freely accorded to them at the North, that such a change had come over the public mind at the North, that, now, very generally, (not universally) the colored man could travel by the public conveyances without insult or injury, and on entirely equal terms with others. But while I was at the South, I felt that an embargo was upon me, so cautiously was the question of Slavery everywhere touched, and such an exceeding sensitiveness generally prevailed. The Southerners feel very sore; and they seek to *justify* themselves and the institution in cases where I expected to find that they would acknowledge Slavery to be an unmitigated evil. But I am hopeful. How can I be otherwise with the paper before me, which tells of a celebration of West India Emancipation? You are descendants of fathers who loved liberty. You inherit the old English Ideas. And I cannot believe that America will long lag behind the old mother-land. [Great applause.]

The above does not claim to be a report, but it is believed to be a pretty accurate sketch of Mr. Carpenter's speech.

The third hymn was then sung, written by Mr. Garrison.

"Ye who in bondage pine,
Shut out from light divine," &c.

At its conclusion Mr. CARPENTER again rose and said, you have just been singing a tune which, I confess, I like very much. It is our British National hymn. We call it *God Save the Queen;* you call it America! I must say that the words to which we sing it at home are not all such as I can join in. But there is another tune—it is called *Emancipation;* it is sung to-day in a glorious chorus by 800,000 West Indian freemen. And I hope that the time is near at hand when it will also be sung by 3,000,000 of your countrymen under circumstances equally glorious and inspirating. (Cheers.)

CHARLES L. REMOND was then called to the platform, and in a few eloquent and stirring words expressed his satisfaction in being with his old friends to-day, with whom it had not been his privilege for so long a time to meet; and his conviction also that never, in the whole history of the movement for the abolition of Slavery, had there been a more hopeful and encouraging time than the present.

It was now nearly one o'clock, and the meeting took a recess for an hour.

AFTERNOON.

At two o'clock, the meeting re-assembled, and, in spite of the heavy rain filled up the great hall; one of the largest in New England.

After the call to order, the 4th hymn was sung:

"Think of our country's glory,
All dimned with Afric's tears,
Her broad flag stained and gory
With the hoarded guilt of years." &c.

EDMUND QUINCY then addressed the meeting. He alluded to the speech of Mr. Carpenter, in the morning, as so pertinent to the occasion and so well received by the meeting. He said that we owed it to the old English love of liberty, we owed it to our English parentage, and in no wise to the Constitution of the United States, that we can hold, and do hold, this meeting to-day. Under the Constitution, with its guarantees, we have as good a right to hold this meeting in Charleston, South Carolina, as in Worcester, Massachusetts. But every American knows full well how utterly impossible the former would be.

What have the Abolitionists done? is often asked. Sir, if they have done nothing else, they have done one thing which is hidden from no man's eyes. They have made the United States Congress a great Anti-Slavery debating society for the whole nation. They have made Congress a useful body almost for the first time. Some people complain of Congress, as having done nothing during the eight months of this long session. Why, sir, I don't grudge them their eight dollars a day, and believe that the money could not be better expended than in keeping them together, and in keeping up this discussion until Slavery be brought entirely to an end.

Mr. Quincy then read a letter which had been recently received from Cassius M. Clay. The letter is highly honorable to Mr. Clay's frank and generous nature, and it is hoped will be published.

WENDELL PHILLIPS followed. It is hardly worth while, said he, at this stage of the meeting to revert again to the particulars of the West India Emancipation. This has been already done, and well done, by others. When England enacted that Emancipation, she tried a new experiment in justice. In those islands the slaves out-numbered the whites, ten, twenty, thirty even to one England came forward to lift into a state of equality in the eye of the law all these slaves, and to put the white men at their mercy. She had faith in the result, and dared to do right. The hour came and passed in peace. For there is a bond stronger than force, a power greater than that of armies—it is gratitude. England has taught us a lesson, on a broad scale, in her West India emancipation.

Mr. Phillips then referred to the early and cautious movements in England against the Slave Trade and Slavery. Gradual emancipation, preparation for freedom, apprenticeship, &c.—these were the only terms proposed or asked; and the cause struggled along doubtfully and hardly alive. Then, amidst all the doubt, uncertainty, and perplexity, arose Elizabeth Heyrick, and declared, as by an innate power of truth, that Slavery *ought to cease at once*—that whether property was safe or not, whether the West Indies produced sugar or nothing; whether the planter was rich or a bankrupt; whether he lived in peace, or his blood flowed over his hearth-stone, the negro had a right to his freedom, as given to him by God, and no man, or nation, or human power had a right to keep it from him. [Great and prolonged applause.]

Some of our friends have alluded to the difference in the position of the English and American Abolitionists. This is a question I care very little to consider. I know that Clarkson, and Sharpe, and Wilberforce and George Thompson, have understood their own work well, and have done it. So must we. But if a parallel to our own portion is to be looked after, I think we shall find a more just one in looking to the missionaries Knibb and Smith in Jamaica. The entire English Church in Jamaica, with its powerful party, was pledged to Slavery. Knibb and Smith went to Jamaica, and said, "Christianity demands that these souls be instructed, and we claim a right as Christian ministers to instruct them" "If this be Christianity," said the West India planters, "away with it; we prefer our system as it is." So they murdered Smith, the worthiest successor of the first Christian martyrs that the world has seen, and would have treated Knibb in like manner, but that the Dissenting interest in England backed him up too strongly. Now the American church of our time is like the Episcopal church in Jamaica; and the Abolitionists hold the relative position of the Baptist missionaries there. And if any man would learn aright the character of the American Anti-Slavery movement and its spirit, if he would know the bitterness of its foes, the violence of their invective and their hate, let him go to the grave of Smith, the martyr of Demerara.

"Our American Church is a weather cock, denoting with exactness the tone and level of the public sentiment and morality. The American pulpit, what is it? What the pews make it. I am not *attacking* the ministers, but I am telling what they are, and what the people make them. Your minister is not chosen to build up your moral and intellectual strength; if so, he would be a reformer. He is chosen to make Unitarians, or Orthodox, or Baptists, or Methodists, as the case may be. The voluntary system is beautiful to a certain extent, but it can never be a reformatory system. It will always cast its anchor where the popular opinion stops. It will always mark the precise point of respectability. Christianity, like the lava from the burning volcano, while it is warm, moves on resistless; but when it grows cold, it stops, it takes shapes, and forms itself into organized bodies, into churches—and ministers. An old Italian in 1582, said that no Christian could die in his bed. There is a truth in it NOW.

No Christian now can be respectable in the entire community where he dwells.

Daniel Webster once said that New Hampshire was a glorious State to be born in and then leave. So the Church of the land and the day is a glorious body to grow up in, and then come out from! It is like the shell of the egg, which the bird will always break, when it has got strength enough to fly.

Our fathers made this Government as it is; they did the best they could; so they thought; God bless them. They were few, they were poor, and weak. They felt they must stand together, or lose all they had won so dearly. And if they, in that difficult and dark hour, without the guidance of any previous experiment, made concessions to Slavery, much may be pardoned to them. But not so with us, now! We are twenty millions strong, rich, covering a vast area of country, spreading ourselves proudly; we shrink from no labor, or hazard or difficulty, elswhere; we take up in the Free States every child that is born and educate it. And can we not grapple with this question; if not, we have learned but poorly, and have cast away the benefit of our fathers' experience. They could not give us a first of August, but they did leave us the power to get it for ourselves. Now, instead of being a light, and guide a blessing to the nations, we are a curse and a reproach. We are the mildew, blighting and blasting our brother's ears. Mexico, Cuba, St. Domingo. It is England now, not America, that is teaching the world lessons of liberty and setting the examples which move and stir to noble deeds. Shame on us! that we have allowed England to outstrip us in the race for freedom. Still let us all, whom the voice of God has summoned to this work, move on undaunted; until the whole nation shall see and understand Daniel Webster, and reject him for the "base metal" that he is. [This too is but a meagre sketch of Mr. Phillips' remarks.]

STEPHEN S. FOSTER was loudly called for, and came forward. He said he heartily sympathized in the feelings of the meeting to-day. I have, sir, said he, hardly the heart to celebrate Emancipation anywhere, while three millions of my own countrymen groan in Slavery—the victims of the vilest cupidity, lust, and oppression. The cry about Sugar, Coffee, and Tobacco, said Mr. F, is most disgusting to me. The great idea of our people is gain; the Yankees think the chief end of man, Mr. President, is to get something *to sell*—then they think they are prospering. God knows I would not care if not another pound of Sugar, Coffee, or Tobacco was ever raised; if they could all go together, considering the mischief they have done in the world, the world would be greatly the gainer by losing them all.

Anti-Slavery can't prosper till we have killed Daniel Webster. Mr. Chairman, I shall be understood to speak figuratively here. I care nothing for his body; I hope Providence will spare him to us as a subject for dissection. But I mean that we must destroy, what is of far more consequence than bodily life, his *reputation*. [A Voice—He has done that for himself.] He knows well that he is a traitor, and a villian. Compare him with Benedict Arnold, and he is far meaner and more despicable than he. Arnold would have betrayed a nation which had some ability to defend itself, into foreign hands. But Daniel Webster pledges himself to give back to her lawless and unprincipled tyrant, the poor defenceless slave-woman, who has been, one by one, robbed of all her children until, desolate and heart-stricken, she flies from the hated scene to find some rest and pity in a land of strangers.

J. B. SYME, a Scotch gentleman, late of Edinburgh, now one of the editors of the "Christian Citizen," was invited to the platform, and made an eloquent and most acceptable address. His remarks we hope will be furnished by his own hand.

The fifth hymn was sung:

"Hark! a voice from heaven proclaiming
Comfort to the mourning slave"——

After which the meeting adjourned, with hearty thanksgiving for the past and renewed hope and courage for the future.

A large number of copies of Whittier's late stirring lines, "A Sabbath Scene," were kindly funished by a friend from Fitchburg, and distributed throughout the meeting. He has our thanks for a good and timely act.

A third meeting was held in the evening, well attended, and addressed by Messrs. GARRISON and C. C. BURLEIGH. But we have no space or time to sketch their remarks.

About one hundred dollars were paid to the Finance Committee for the expenses of the meeting.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, *President.*

SAMUEL MAY, Jr. } *Secretaries.*
BENJAMIN SNOW, Jr }

COLONIZATION OF AFRICA.

To the Honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

The undersigned, for himself and others associated, respectfully begs leave to present to the consideration of Congress the following propositions, to which they have given much reflection:

First: The suppression of the African Slave Trade.

Second: The carrying of the Mails between the United States and the Republic of Liberia.

Third: To extend and regulate Trade between the United States and Liberia.

The independence of the Republic of Liberia has been acknowledged by the greatest powers of Europe. It is an off-shot from our own country, and is peopled by emigrants from all the States of this Union. It already embraces within the action of its Government and laws many of the natives and several of the Kings and Princes of the West Coast of Africa, who seek its protection, trust in its beneficence, and offer their allegiance as citizens.

When the Republic of Liberia shall have completed the purchase of the Gallinas, for which negotiations are now in progress, the sea-coast will embrace upward of seven hundred miles

The first settlement from this country was made in 1821; and the infant Colony, under incredible embarrassments, against the combinations and efforts of an inhuman and mercenary spirit, and the earlier and almost indomitable prejudice and hostility of native tribes, has gradually and peacefully extended its borders; received, protected and educated emigrants from the United States, and many of the natives; has triumphed over all obstacles, and now presents to the world a free, vigorous and permanent Commonwealth.

Its destiny may be predicted.

Its extension on that heretofore desecrated coast; its ultimate influence over all that great division of the globe; the suppression of the Slave Trade, not only within the present limits of the Republic, but shortly from Sierra Leone to Cape Palmas, and eventually from the entire coast; the great and increasing emigration from this country to the fertile regions of the Republic; the diffusion of knowledge and Civilization, of Christianity, of the Arts and Sciences, and of extended and heretofore unknown Commerce indicate that destiny.

Its foreign, its minerals, its soil, its climate, and the already various and extensive productions of the necessaries and luxuries of life, form so many unfailing sources for our commerce.

The undersigned and his associates, looking to the preceding high public objects, and also to their private objects of pecuniary results, propose to build four steamships, which shall combine in a higher degree than has yet been attained, the necessary qualities of speed, strength, space and ventilation, each of which to be commanded by a Lieutenant of the United States Navy.

Each ship shall not be of less than *four thousand tuns*, and warranted to be of superior quality in all respects, to to any steamships now afloat, or in progress of construction, for war purposes, or for the proposed service, and capable of going from New York to Liverpool in eight days.

Each ship to make not less than *four* trips per annum, leaving New Orleans, Norfolk, Baltimore, and New York, or such other ports as may be reasonably indicated by the United States.

The Government of the United States shall have the power to take any and all of said ships, when required for war purposes, by paying the cost of construction, and a commission of ten per centum, and at all times the right to place on board of each ship *two* guns of heavy calibre, and the men necessary to serve them, and also to send out on board of any of said vessels any agent or agents of the Government to Liberia, free from cost for transportation or subsistence.

The undersigned and his associates estimate the cost of such ships, as heretofore named, at $900,000 each, and they ask the United States to advance to them *two-thirds* of the money in five per cent. stocks, to be repaid into the Treasury, with the interest, in equal annual instalments, during the existence of the contract; which contract they propose shall continue for *twenty years*, renewable at the pleasure of the Government.

The sum of six hundred thousand dollars to be advanced in five per cent stocks from time to time, on each ship, as it shall progress in construction, and the Government to hold a lien upon each ship to secure the advance.

Two of said ships shall be finished and ready for sea on or before the first day of October, 1852, and the two others on or before the first day of October, 1854; so that an opportunity may be given to ascertain the efficiency of the two first constructed, and make such improvements as will best comply with their obligations to the Government.

Each ship shall be in readiness to convey the mails to and from Liberia, and shall provide passage and subsistence for such mail agent as the Post Office Department shall appoint.

In consideration of the above named services, and the creation of this powerful addition to the effective marine for public and national purposes, ready whenever the emergency shall arise to require its entire employment by the Government, and for affording facilities for cheap and rapid emigration to Liberia, the undersigned and his associates shall be paid the sum of——dollars for each and every trip to and from Liberia during said term of contract.

In further consideration of the mutual public benefits to the citizens of both countries, they ask to be permitted to introduce into the ports of the United States the products of the Republic of Liberia free of duty; provided that the productions of this country be admitted into Liberia in like manner.

And on the further consideration that the American Colonization Society shall have the right and authority to send on each of the four said ships, on each and every voyage, they may respectively make, not exceeding four thousand emigrants, being free persons of color, from the United States to Liberia, on pre-payment of ten dollars for each emigrant over twelve years of age, and five dollars for each emigrant under twelve years of age, which also includes the transportation of the baggage, and the daily supply of sailors' rations, and to convey and bring back free from cost such agents as they from time to time choose to send.

The public benefits to be derived from this enterprise, it is believed, are alike practical, philanthropic, and obvious; and its advantages to the emigrants may be ascertained from the fact, that the cost per head under the most untiring and favorable efforts of the American Colonization Society, is $30 for adults, and half-price for children.

The undersigned and his associates believe that small ships, either steamers or sail vessels, cannot be successfully employed in the transportation of emigrants at so low a price, but the rapidity of the voyage, and the number to be transported will enable them to reduce the cost of passage by a saving of subsistence during the voyage.

Small steamers could not carry the necessary fuel to make any speed in a voyage of over 4,000 miles, and consequently they would not be efficient in the suppression of the Slave Trade.

Hence, therefore, the above projection of service is considered effecuive for all practical purposes; the suppression of the Slave Trade by the continued presence of such vessels; the encouragement and protection of our commerce, and the much desired object of quick, cheap, safe and commodious transportation, which must necessarily lead to numerous emigration. JOSEPH BRYAN, of Alabama,
for himself and his Associates.

—The above memorial was presented to Congress several months since, and we pigeon-holed it at the time, as a nest-egg worth watching, and one which would probably bring forth after its kind in due season. Eggs of this sort have not usually been suffered to addle by the national bird, and there was little reason to suppose this would be, inasmuch as the cackling therefor, at its laying, was done by The *Tribune*. Accordingly, the shell is chipped, and the American Vulture screams over another hungry youngling. The kind old hen of the North will see to it that it does not suffer for want of its appropriate food—the flesh of blacks.

The purpose of this memorial is obvious enough. There is no more attempt to disguise it than a decent show of respect for the professed morality and republicanism of the people renders, it is thought, still necessary; for there is that much reverence as yet paid to right, that wrong is only perpetrated in its name. The Colonization Society is in a languishing condition; its thirty years' existence—the influence of the most distinguished Southern Statemen in its behalf—the devotion of able minds, and the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars, have failed utterly in accomplishing the object it first promised to itself, and to its mother Slavery, and have succeeded only in planting upon the arid and sterile coast of Africa a feeble colony of a few superannuated and ignorant blacks emancipated by their masters only when about to travel to that bourne where slaves can no longer be of service, and where the consciousness of their past possession may be a heavy burden. The brilliant promise of removing the pestilent example of freedom to their fellows out of the sight of the slaves, and of establishing the negative proof that the negro can not live a freeman, by denying him even the accidental privilege of being one, has been broken to the hope by the obstinate preference of the free blacks for a poor home—but still a home—in the land of their birth to an exile to the inhospitable and savage shores of Africa. The brilliant scheme, which was to secure the slave system in perpetuity by rendering it impossible for the negro to live in America except as a slave, and to guard it against all attacks from Northern fanaticism by diverting it into a channel where it might run harmlessly forever, has proved only a brilliant failure. Southern cunning, wise as a serpent, and the wily agreement of the sleek shepherds of the Northern flocks, who would thus head off the storm they foresaw might burst over their folds, could not make a lie the truth, nor pervert to the doing of a great wrong the simple instincts of the people. It only needed one bold young man to expose the scheme to kill it.

—But what the people will not do of themselves they may do through their Government, for our national morality is come to be sifted down to this—that the highest law is the law of the State, and the Government can do no wrong. Accordingly Colonization, which languished and died when seeking strength from private and spontaneous benevolence, is to be revived by breathing the breath of life into its nostrils from the national lungs A report is now before the House of Representatives from the Naval Committee recommending the passage of a Bill embodying the main features of this memorial. The memorial itself we publish to show the origin of the plan, should it become, as is not unlikely, a law. The Report, which is too long for this number of the *Standard*, we shall publish next week.

Here, perhaps, is a battle to be fought over again, but by greater odds than before. Should the bill pass, the expatriation of the free colored people will have become the avowed national policy, backed up, probably, by the Whig party as a Whig measure. Mr. Webster, who two, or three years ago, exclaimed in a Colonization meeting in Boston, "It is a scheme of the slaveholders to get rid of their slaves, and I will have nothing to do with it," now avows his readiness to see millions appropriated from the National Treasury for the transportation—a punishment in England for the highest crimes—to a torrid and deadly climate of hundreds of thousands of American citizens whose misfortune it is that they are descended from those against whom the crime of transportation hither was perpetrated a century or two ago. The policy is avowed and defended by the *Tribune*, and other leading Whig presses, who doubtless hope, as the original Colonizationists hoped, that they may thus direct into a harmless direction the growing Anti-Slavery sentiment of the North. Liberia, which, in thirty years, has not received so many Colonists—and those coerced into emigration—as Great Britain sends in a month to this country, or in a year to Australia, or as the older States have sent in a few weeks to California, is to be encircled by the enforced—for enforced it must be, if at all—emigration of the whole free colored population of the United States. At any rate, the scheme, if carried into operation, must defer the day of Emancipation in the slave States, by inducing their Legislatures to pass laws prohibiting manumission except with the condition of exportation to Liberia. Shall such a project succeed? The Abolitionists have defeated it once. Will they not do it again? Should the subject pass over the present Congress, it is a point to which, till the next session, or till the project is defeated, their labors should be directed.

☞ We regret to observe in the *Liberator* of last week the death, on the 24th ultimo, of LUCRETIA AUGUSTA COWING, of Weymouth, Mass. She has been from childhood connected with the Anti-Slavery cause, and so completely identified herself with it that it would be as impossible as ungrateful for the cause's sake, to speak of her without referring to that connection.—Those who have known the Boston Fair familiarly for years past will greatly miss in future her pleasant and graceful presence, and her unobtrusive but efficient and powerful aid. The death of a young, gifted, and cultivated woman like Miss Cowing, whose youth and energies have been laid freely upon the altar of the Anti-Slavery cause should prompt us to heed and profit by the lesson which such a life as hers teaches. If in the make-believe and frivolous world about us it is rare to see a woman at the age when usually lighter matters are the objects of life, give herself unreservedly to a purpose which can only give in return a sense of duty performed, so we may renew our faith in, and our devotion to a cause which enlists such advocates.

Miss Cowing was the daughter of Balch Cowing of Weymouth, and her age at her death was 33 years.

THE MEETING AT WORCESTER.—We are greatly indebted to our friend S. May, Jr. for a copy of the Report of the proceeding of the great 1st of August Meeting at Worcester, which we publish in another column. We may venture without hesitation to return the thanks of our readers, as well as our own, to Mr. May for his prompt kindness.

CONGRESS---THE OMNIBUS BILL.

THE final fate of the Compromise Bill is probably news now to nobody. We copy, however, the report of the last debate and the various votes on amendments which led to its defeat:

SENATE, July 31, 1850.

Nothing of importance was done during the morning hour. The Compromise bill was taken up at 12, the question pending being on Mr. Norris's amendment of yesterday.

Mr. Davis, of Mississippi, declared that he had no fear of civil war. The American could not be induced to draw his sword upon his brother. The patriot General Scott, whose blood had been a free offering upon every field for so many years, who had so long and with so much honor, drawn his sword in behalf of the Union, would break that sword a thousand times before he would draw it against his brethren of Texas. This was the feeling of the army generally. He referred to the nullification war, remarking that he was then in the army, and amongst those who anticipated being ordered to Charleston: and, much as he then valued his commission, as much as he desired to remain in the army, that commission would have been torn in tatters the moment he was ordered to pull trigger upon a South Carolinian. This was now the sentiment of the people. Where would volunteers be obtained to fight against Texas. They would have to get a foreign army, a Swiss corps, whose presence in such a cause would draw every patriotic son of America to the aid of Texas.

After some further debate by Messrs. Baldwin, Ewing and Mason, the amendment was rejected—yeas 32, nays 20, as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Badger, Baldwin, Bell, Bradbury, Bright, Cass, Chase, Clay, Cooper, Dayton, Dickinson, Dodge, of Iowa, Douglas, Felch, Green, Hamlin, Jones, Mangum, Miller, Norris, Phelps, Pratt, Seward, Shields, Smith, Spruance, Sturgeon, Underwood, Upham, Wales, and Winthrop

NAYS—Messrs. Atchinson, Barnwell, Benton, Berrien, Butler, Davis, of Miss., Dawson, Downs, Ewing, Hunter, King, Mason, Morton, Pearce, Rusk, Soulé, Turney, Walker, Whitcomb, and Yulee.

Mr. Pearce moved to amend the bill by striking out all in relation to New Mexico. His reason was, that the Senate yesterday crippled the provision for the establishment of a territorial government in New Mexico by adopting an amendment providing, "that that government shall not go into operation on the east side of the Rio Grande, pending the action of the Board of Commissioners on the boundary of Texas."

Mr. Clay appealed to Mr. Pearce to withdraw his amendment for the present; it was the design to offer amendments which would relieve the bill of the difficulties which the Senator had alluded to.

Mr. Pearce said he had no desire to defeat the bill or the provision for the settlement of the Texas boundary question. He designed if his pending motion should be agreed to, to follow it by a motion to restore that which was stricken out yesterday on motion of the Senator from Georgia, and to move an amendment providing that the territoral government of New Mexico should not go into operation before the 4th of March, 1851. He could not vote for the bill in its present condition, and would not be coerced into voting for it, because certain others could not have it passed in exact compliance with their demands. If he defeated the bill he could not help it; he was determined to maintain, to some extent at least, the independence of his own judgment. After some conversation, Mr. Pearce varied the form, but not the effect, of his amendment, by striking out all that relates to New Mexico, and then reinstating the whole of it, except the amendment moved yesterday by Mr. Dawson, in lieu of which he offered a provision. "that the territoral government of New Mexico shall not go into effect until the 4th of March next."

Mr. Rusk opposed the amendment, saying that if justice was done to Texas in the bill, it would receive his vote.

Mr. Shields said he, yesterday, gave his vote for Mr. Bradbury's amendment as amended by Mr. Dawson, a vote which, upon reflection, he could not defend here or elsewhere, and he was glad of the opportunity now afforded to him to retrieve that vote. which, upon reflection, he could not defend here or elsewhere, and he was glad of the opportunity now afforded to him to retrieve that vote. He would now vote in favor of Mr. Pearce's proposition.

Mr. Dawson defended his amendment.

Mr. Yulee requested Mr. Pearce to divide his amendment, and allow the question to be first taken upon a motion to strike out.

Mr. Pearce assented.

Mr. Benton submitted some further remarks, to show that not only California but Texas had been delayed by the combination of incongruous measures. In commenting upon Mr. Dawson's amendment adopted yesterday, and its effect upon the bill, he compared the latter to the play of "Hamlet with the part of Hamlet left out." The bill in its present form established a territorial government with the government out, because as he showed by reference to the map, the inhabitants of New Mexico were all east of the Rio Grande, and there is not a single village even on the west side, which any Senator had ever heard of, and he challenged any Senator to mention the name of a single place upon that side. He considered Mr. Dawson's amendment at some length, assuming that it contains a most flagrant dereliction of duty in providing that the treaty of Hidalgo shall not be carried into effect, because that treaty made it the duty of Congress to extend a government to the people of New Mexico.

After debate by Mr. Dawson and Mr. Houston, the question being taken on Mr. Pearce's motion to strike out, it was agreed to—yeas 33, nays 22.

Mr. Pearce then moved to amend the bill, by restoring all that portion which had just been stricken out, except Mr Dawson's amendment of yesterday, in lieu of which he presented a clause, "providing that the territorial government of New Mexico shall not go into operation until the 4th of March next."

Mr. Douglass moved to amend the amendment, by striking out Mr. Pearce's provision, "that the Board of Commissioners on the Texas boundary shall report by a time stated, and that their action should be presented to Congress during its next session, suspending the operation of the territorial government of New Mexico until after the commissioners shall have agreed upon terms; and that in the meantime the rights of both the United States and Texas shall remain unchanged and unaffected." This amendment was rejected—yeas 24, nays 33.

Mr. Hale moved an indefinite postponement of the bill, which was rejected—yeas 27, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—Baldwin, Barnwell, Benton, Butler, Chase, Clarke, Clemens, Davis of Mass., Davis of Miss., Dayton, Dodge of Wis., Ewing, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Hunter, Mason, Miller, Phelps, Seward, Smith, Sewell, Turney, Upham, Walker, Winthrop, Yulee.

NAYS—Atchinson. Badger, Bell, Berrien, Bradbury, Bright, Cass, Clay, Cooper, Dawson, Dickinson, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Downs, Felch, Foote, Houston, Jones, King, Mangum, Morton, Norris, Pearce, Pratt. Rusk, Sebastian, Shields, Spruance, Sturgeon, Wales.

Mr Douglass' amendment to Mr. Pearce's amendment was rejected—ayes 24, nays 32.

Mr. Dawson then moved to amend the amendment by striking out the proviso or new matter introduced by Mr. Pearce.

Mr. Turney moved an indefinite postponement, which was lost, 29 to 30.

Mr. Underwood's motion to amend Mr. Pearce's amendment was then rejected—25 to 32.

Mr. Yulee moved to amend Mr. Pearce's amendment, by striking out all that related to Texas, which was agreed to—29 to 28, as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Barnwell, Benton, Butler, Chase, Clarke, Davis of Mass., Davis of Miss, Dayton, Dodge of Wis, Ewing, Greene, Hamlin, Houston, Hunter, Mason, Miller, Morton, Phelps, Rusk, Sebastian, Seward, Smith, Sewell, Turney, Upham, Walker, Yulee and Winthrop.

NAYS—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Bell, Berrien, Bradbury, Bright, Cass, Clay, Clemens, Dawson, Dickinson, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Dowes, Felch, Foote, Jones, King, Mangum, Norris, Pearce, Pratt, Shields, Spruance, Sturgeon, Underwood, Wales and Whitcomb.

Mr. Chase moved the indefinite postponement of the bill. Lost—29 to 28.

Mr. Sebastian moved to adjourn. Lost, 14 to 42.

The question being then taken on Mr. Pearce's amendment as amended, it was rejected—25 to 28, as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Bell, Berrien, Bradbury, Bright, Cass, Clemens, Dawson, Dickinson, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Downs, Felch, Foote, Jones, King, Mangum, Morton, Pearce, Phelps, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Smith, Soulé, Turney, Yulee.

NAYS—Messrs. Baldwin, Bell, Bradbury, Bright, Cass, Chase, Clay, Cooper, Davis of Massachusetts, Dayton, Dickinson, Dodge of Wisconsin, Douglas, Ewing, Felch, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Miller, Norris, Seward, Shields, Spruance, Sturgeon, Underwood, Upham, Wales, Walker, Whitcomb, Winthrop.

It will be seen that the bill now contained nothing but the admission of California and the territorial government for Utah.

Mr. Douglas made several ineffectual motions to amend the. boundary of Utah. Motions to adjourn and to postpone indefinitely were also made and rejected.

Mr. Berrien moved to strike out the provision in the bill giving California two representatives in Congress; lost, 21 to 36.

YEAS—Atchison, Badger, Barnwell, Berrien, Butler, Clemens, Davis of Mississippi, Dawson, Downs, Foote, Hunter, King, Mangum, Mason, Morton, Pearce, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Soulé, Turney, Yulee.

NAYS—Baldwin, Benton, Bell, Bradbury, Bright, Cass, Chase, Clarke, Clay, Cooper, Davis of Massachusetts, Dayton, Dickinson, Dodge of Wisconsin, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Ewing, Felch, Greene,

Poetry.

THE CHAPEL.

[*From Browning's new Poem, "Christmas-Eve and Easter-Day."*]

"Out of the little chapel I burst
Into the fresh night air again.
I had waited a good five minutes first
In the door-way, to escape the rain
That drove in gusts down the common's centre,
At the edge of which the chapel stands,
Before I plucked up heart to enter:
Heaven knows how many sorts of hands
Reached past me, groping for the latch
Of the inner door that hung on catch,
More obstinate the more they fumbled,
Till, giving way at last with a scold
Of the crazy hinge, in squeezed or tumbled
One sheep more to the rest in fold,
And left me irresolute, standing sentry
In the sheep-fold's lath-and-plaster-entry,
Four feet long by two feet wide,
Partitioned off from the vast inside—
I blocked up half of it at least.
No remedy; the rain kept driving:
They eyed me much as some wild beast,
That congregation, still arriving,
Some of them by the main road, white
A long way past me into the night,
Skirting the common, then diverging;
Not a few suddenly emerging
From the common's self through the paling-gaps—
They house in the gravel-pits perhaps,
Where the road stops short with its safeguard border
Of lamps, as tired of such disorder;
But the most turned in yet more abruptly
From a certain squalid knot of allies,
Where the town's bad blood once slept corruptly,
Which now the little chapel rallies
And leads into day again—its priestliness
Lending itself to hide their beastliness
So cleverly (thanks in part to the mason),
And putting so cheery a white-washed face on
Those neophytes too much in lack of it,
That, where you cross the common as I did,
And meet the party thus presided,
"Mount Zion," with Love-lane at the back of it,
They front you as little disconcerted,
As, bound for the hills, her fate averted
And her wicked people made to mind him,
Lot might have marched with Gomorrah behind him.

II.

Well, from the road, the lanes or the common,
In came the flock: and the fat weary woman,
Panting and bewildered, down-clapping
Her umbrella with a mighty report,
Grounded it by me, wry and flapping,
A wreck of whalebones; then, with a snort,
Like a startled horse, at the interloper
Who humbly knew himself improper,
But could not shrink up small enough,
Round to the door, and in—the gruff
Hinge's invariable scold
Making your very blood run cold.
Prompt in the wake of her, up-pattered
On broken clogs, the many-tattered
Little old-faced, peaking sister-turned-mother
Of the sickly babe she tried to smother
Somehow up with its spotted face,
From the cold, on her breast, the one warm place;
She too must stop, wring the poor suds dry
Of a draggled shawl, and add thereby
Her tribute to the door-mat, sopping
Already from my own clothes' dropping,
Which yet she seemed to grudge I should stand on;
Then stooping down to take off her pattens,
She bore them defiantly, in each hand one,
Planted together before her breast
And its babe, as good as a lance in rest.
Close on her heels, the dingy satins
Of a female something, past me flitted,
With lips as much too white, as a streak
Lay far too red on each hollow cheek;
And it seemed the very door-hinge pitied
All that was left of a womance once,
Holding at least its tongue for the nonce.
Then a tall yellow man, like the Penitent Thief,
With his jaw bound up in a handkerchief,
And eyelids screwed together tight,
Led himself in by some inner light.
And, except from him, from each that entered,
I had the same interrogation—
"What, you, the alien, you have ventured
"To take with us, elect, your station?
"A carer for none of it, a Gallio?"
Thus, plain as print, I read ye glance
At a common prey, in each countenance,
As of huntsman giving his hounds the tallyho:
And, when the door's cry drowned their wonder,
The draught, it always sent in shutting,
Made the flame of the single tallow candle
In the cracked square lanthorn I stood under,
Shoot its blue lip at me, rebutting,
As it were, the luckless cause of scandal:
I verily thought the zealous light
(In the chapel's secret, too!) for spite,
Would shudder itself clean off the wick,
With the airs of a St. John's Candlestick.
There was no standing it much longer,
"Good folks," said I, as resolve grew stronger,
"This way you perform the Grand-Inquisitor,
"When the weather sends you a chance visitor?
"You are the men and wisdom shall die with you,
"And none of the old Seven Churches vie with you!
"But still, despite the pretty perfection
"To which you carry your trick of exclusiveness,
"And, taking God's word under wise protection,
"Correct its tendency to diffusiveness,
"Bidding me reach it over hot ploughshares,—
"Still, as I say, though you've found salvation,
"If I should choose to cry—as now—'Shares!'—
"See if the best of you bars me my ration!
"Because I prefer for my expounder
"Of the laws of the feast, the feast's own Founder:
"Mine's the same right with your poorest and sickliest,
"Supposing I don the marriage-vestiment:
"So, shut your mouth, and open your Testament,
"And carve me my portion at your quickliest."
Accordingly, as a shoemaker's lad
With wizened face in want of soap,
And wet apron wound round his waist like a rope,
After stopping outside, for his cough was bad,
To get the fit over, poor gentle creature,
And so avoid disturbing the preacher,
Passed in, I sent my elbow spikewise
At the shutting door, and entered likewise,—
Received the hinge's accustomed greeting,
Crossed the threshold's magic pentacle,
And found myself in full conventicle,
—To wit, in Zion Chapel Meeting,
On the Christmas-Eve of Forty-nine,
Which calling its flock to their special clover,
Found them assembled and one sheep over,
Whose lot, as the weather pleased, was mine.

III.

I very soon had enough of it.
The hot smell and the human noises,
And my neighbor's coat, the greasy cuff of it,
Were a pebble-stone that a child's hand poises,
Compared with the pig-of-lead-like pressure
Of the preaching-man's immense stupidity,
As he poured his doctrine forth, full measure,
To meet his audience's avidity.
You needed not the wit of the Sybil
To guess the cause of it all in a twinkling—
No sooner had our friend an inkling
Of treasure hid in the Holy Bible,
(Whenever it was the thought first struck him
How Death, at unawares, might duck him
Deeper than the grave, and quench
The gin-shop's light in Hell's grim drench)
That he handled it so in fine irreverence,
As to hug the Book of books to pieces:
And, a patchwork of chapters and texts in severance,
Not improved by the private dog's-ears and creases,
Having clothed his own soul with, he'd fain see
equipt yours,
So tossed you again your Holy Scriptures.—
And you picked them up, in a sense, no doubt:
Nay had but a single face of my neighbors
Appeared to suspect that the preacher's labors
Were help which the world could be saved without,
'Tis odds but I had borne in quiet
A qualm or two at my spiritual diet;
Or, who can tell? had even mustered
Somewhat to urge in behalf of the sermon:
But the flock sate on, divinely flustered,
Sniffling, methought, its dew of Hermon
With such content in every snuffle,
As the devil inside us loves to ruffle.
My old fat-woman purred with pleasure,
And thumb round thumb went twirling faster,
While she to his periods keeping measure,
Maternally devoured the pastor.
The man with the handkerchief, untied it,
Showed us a horrible wen inside it,
Gave his eyelids yet another screwing,
And rocked himself as the other was doing.
The shoemaker's lad, discreetly choking,
Kept down his cough. 'Twas too provoking!
My gorge rose at the nonsense and stuff of it,
And saying like Eve when she plucked the apple,
"I wanted a taste, and now there's enough of it,"
I flung out of the little Chapel."

Miscellany.

THE BELGIAN LACE-MAKERS.

The indefatigable, patient, invincible, inquisitive, sometimes tedious, but almost always amusing German traveller, Herr Kohl, has recently been pursuing his earnest investigations in Belgium. His book on the Netherlands* has just been issued, and we shall translate, with abridgments, one of its most instructive and agreeable chapters—that relating to Lace-making.

The practical acquaintance of our female readers with that elegant ornament, lace, is chiefly confined to wearing it, and their researches into its quality and price. A few minutes' attention to Mr. Kohl will enlighten them on other subjects connected with, what is to them, a most interesting topic, for lace is associated with recollections of mediæval history, and with the palmy days of the Flemish school of painting. More than one of the celebrated masters of that school have selected, from among his laborious countrywomen, the lace-makers (or, as they are called in Flanders, *Speldewerksters*), pleasing subjects for the exercise of his pencil. The plump, fair-haired Flemish girl, bending earnestly over her lace-work, whilst her fingers nimbly ply the intricately winding bobbins, figure in many of those highly esteemed representations of homely life and manners, which have found their way from the Netherlands into all the principal picture-galleries of Europe.

Our German friend makes it his practice, whether he is treating of the geology of the earth, or of the manufacture of Swedish bodkins, to begin at the very beginning. He therefore commences the history of lace-making, which, he says, is, like embroidery, an art of very ancient origin, lost, like a multitude of other origins, "in the darkness of by-gone ages." It may, with truth, be said that it is the national occupation of the women of the Low Countries, and one to which they have steadily adhered from very remote times. During the long civil and foreign wars waged by the people of the Netherlands, while subject to Spanish dominion, other branches of Belgic industry either dwindled to decay, or were transplanted to foreign countries; but lace-making remained faithful to the land which had fostered and brought it to perfection, though it received tempting offers from abroad, and had to struggle with many difficulties at home. This Mr. Kohl explains by the fact, that lace-making is a branch of industry chiefly confined to female hands, and, as women are less disposed to travel than men, all arts and handicrafts exclusively pursued by women have a local and enduring character.

Notwithstanding the overwhelming supply of imitations which modern ingenuity has created, *real Brussels lace* has maintained its value, like the precious metals and the precious stones. In the patterns of the best bone lace, the changeful influence of fashion is less marked than in most other branches of industry; indeed, she has adhered with wonderful pertinacity to the quaint old patterns of former times. These are copied and reproduced with that scrupulous uniformity which characterises the figures in the Persian and Indian shawls. Frequent experiments have been tried to improve these old patterns, by the introduction of slight and tasteful modifications, but these innovations have not succeeded, and a very skilful and experienced lace-worker assured Mr. Kohl, that the antiquated designs, with all their formality, are preferred to those in which the most elegant changes have been effected.

Each of the lace-making towns of Belgium excels in the production of one particular description of lace: in other words, each has what is technically called its own *point*. The French word *point*, in the ordinary language of needlework, signifies simply *stitch*; but in the terminology of lace-making, the word is sometimes used to designate the pattern of the lace, and sometimes the ground of the lace itself. Hence the terms *point de Bruxelles, point de Malines, point de Valenciennes*, &c. In England we distinguish by the name of Point, a peculiarly rich and curiously wrought lace, formerly very fashionable, but now scarcely ever worn except in Court costume. In this sort of lace the pattern is, we believe, worked with the needle, after the ground has been made with the bobbins. In each town there prevail certain modes of working, and certain patterns which have been transmitted from mother to daughter successively, for several generations.—Many of the lace-workers live and die in the same houses in which they were born; and most of them understand and practise only the stitches which their mothers and grandmothers worked before them. The consequence has been, that certain *points* have become unchangeably fixed in particular towns or districts. Fashion has assigned to each its particular place and purpose; for example: the *point de Malines* (Mechlin lace) is used chiefly for trimming night-dresses, pillow-cases, coverlets, &c.; the *point de Valenciennes* (Valenciennes lace) is employed for ordinary wear or negligé; but the more rich and costly *point de Bruxelles* (Brussels lace) is reserved for bridal and ball-dresses, and for the robes of queens and courtly ladies.

As the different sorts of lace, from the narrowest and plainest to the broadest and richest, are innumerable, so the division of labor among the lace-workers is infinite. In the town of Belgium there are as many different kinds of lace-workers as there are varieties of spiders in Nature. It is not, therefore, surprising that in the several departments of this branch of industry there are as many technical terms and phrases as would make up a small dictionary. In their origin, these expressions were all Flemish; but French being the language now spoken in Belgium, they have been translated into French, and the designations applied to some of the principal classifications of the work-women. Those who make only the ground, are called *Drocheleuses*. The design or pattern, which adorns this ground, is distinguished by the general term "the Flowers;" though it would be difficult to guess what flowers are intended to be portrayed by the fantastic arabesque of these lace-patterns. In Brussels, the ornaments or flowers are made separately, and afterwards worked into the lace-ground: in other places the ground and the patterns are worked conjointly. The *Platteuses* are those who work the flowers separately; and the *Faiseuses de point a l'aiguille* work the figures and the ground together. The *Striquese* is the worker who attaches the flowers to the ground. The *Faneuse* works her figures by piercing holes or cutting out pieces of the ground.

The spinning of the fine thread used for lace-making in the Netherlands, is an operation demanding so high a degree of minute care and vigilant attention, that it is impossible it can ever be taken from human hands by machinery. None but Belgian fingers are skilled in this art. The very finest sort of this thread is made in Brussels, in damp underground cellars; for it is so extremely delicate, that it is liable to break by contact with the dry air above ground; and it is obtained in good condition only, when made and kept in a humid subterraneous atmosphere. There are numbers of old Belgian thread-makers who, like spiders, have passed the best part of their lives spinning in cellars. This sort of occupation naturally has an injurious effect on the health, and therefore, to induce people to follow it, they are highly paid.

To form an accurate idea of this operation, it is necessary to see a Brabant Thread-spinner at her work. She carefully examines every thread, watching it closely as she draws it off the distaff; and that she may see it the more distinctly, a piece of dark blue paper is used as a background for the flax. Whenever the spinner notices the least unevenness, she stops the evolution of her wheel, breaks off the faulty piece of flax, and then resumes her spinning. This fine flax being as costly as gold, the pieces thus broken off are carefully laid aside to be used in other ways. All this could never be done by machinery. It is different in the spinning of cotton, silk, or wool, in which the original threads are almost all of uniform thickness. The invention of the English Flax-spinning Machine, therefore, can never supersede the work of the Belgian Fine Thread Spinners, any more than the Bobbin-Net Machine can rival the fingers of the Brussels lace-makers, or render their delicate work superfluous.

The prices current of the Brabant spinners usually include a list of varrious sorts of thread suited to lace-making, varying from 60 francs to 1800 francs per pound. Instances have occured, in which as much as 10,000 francs have been paid for a pound of this fine yarn. So high a price has never been attained by the best spun silk; though a pound of silk, in its raw condition, is incomparably more valuable than a pound of flax. In like manner, a pound of iron may, by dint of human labor and ingenuity, be rendered more valuable than a pound of gold.

Lace-making, in regard to the health of the operatives, has one great advantage. It is a business which is carried on without the necessity of assembling great numbers of workpeople in one place, or of taking women from their homes, and thereby breaking the bonds of family union. It is, moreover, an occupation which affords those employed in it a great degree of freedom. The spinning-wheel and lace-pillows are easily carried from place to place, and the work may be done with equal convenience in the house, in the garden, or at the street-door. In every Belgian town in which lace-making is the staple business, the eye of the traveler is continually greeted with pictures of happy industry, attended by all its train of concomitant virtues. The costliness of the material employed in the work, viz., the fine flax thread, fosters the observance of order and economy, which, as well as habits of cleanliness, are firmly engrafted among the people. Much manual dexterity, quickness of eye, and judgment, are demanded in lace-making; and the work is a stimulater of ingenuity and taste; so that, unlike other occupations merely manual, it tends to rouse rather than to dull the mind. It is, moreover, unaccompanied by any unpleasant and harrassing noise; for the humming of the spinning-wheel, and the regular tapping of the little bobbins, are sounds not in themselves disagreeable, or sufficiently loud to disturb conversation, or to interrupt the social song.

In Belgium, female industry presents itself under aspects alike interesting to the painter, the poet, and the philanthropist. Here and there may be seen a happy-looking girl, seated at an open window, turning her spinning-wheel or working at her lace-pillow, whilst at intervals she indulges in the relaxation of a curious gaze at the passers-by in the street. Another young *Speldewerkster*, more sentimentally disposed, will retire into the garden, seating herself in an umbrageous arbor, or under a spreading tree, her eyes intent on her work, but her thoughts apparently divided between it and some object nearer to her heart. At a doorway sits a young mother, surrounded by two or three children playing round the little table or wooden settle on which her lace-pillow rests. Whilst the mother's busy fingers are thus profitably employed, her eyes keep watch over the movements of her little ones, and she can at the same time spare an attentive thought for some one of her humble household duties.

Dressmakers, milliners, and other females employed in the various occupations which minister to the exigencies of fashion, are confined to close rooms, surrounded by masses of silk, muslin, &c. They are debarred the healthful practice of working in the open air, and can scarcely venture even to sit at an open window, because a drop of rain or a puff of wind may be fatal to their work and its materials. The lace-maker, on the contrary, whose work requires only her thread and her fingers, is not disturbed by a refreshing breeze or a light shower; and even when the weather is not particularly fine, she prefers sitting at her street-door or in her garden, where she enjoys a brighter light than within doors.

In most of the principal towns of the Netherlands there is one particular locality which is the focus of lace-making industry; and there, in fine weather, the streets are animated by the presence of the busy work-women. In each of these districts there is usually one wide open street which the *Speldewerksters* prefer to all others, and in which they assemble, and form themselves into the most picturesque groups imaginable. It is curious to observe them, pouring out of narrow lanes and alleys, carrying with them their chairs and lace-pillows, to take their places in the wide open street, where they can enjoy more of bright light and fresh air than in their own places of abode.

"I could not help contrasting," says Kohl, "the pleasing aspect of these streets with the close and noisy workrooms in woolen and cotton manufactories. There the workpeople are all separated and classified according to age and sex, and marshalled like soldiers. There domestic and family ties are rudely broken. There chance or exigency separates the young factory girl from her favorite companions, and dooms her to association with strangers. There social conversation and the merry song are drowned in that stunning din of machinery, which in the end paralyses even the power of thought."

Our German friend is a little hard upon factory life. Though not so picturesque, it does not, if candidly viewed, offer so very unfavorable a contrast to that passed by the Belgian Lace Workers.—*Dickens' Household Words.*

* Reisen in der Neiderlanden. Travels in the Netherlands.

WEEDS.

It is remarkable that these troublesome plants have come very generally from the Old World; they do not belong here, but, following the steps of the white man, they have crossed the ocean with him. A very large proportion of the most common weeds in our fields and gardens, and about our buildings, are strangers to the soil. It will be easy to name a number of these: such, for instance, as the dock and the burdock, found about every barn and outbuilding; the common plantains and mallows—regular path-weeds; the groundsel, purslane, pigweed, goose-foot, shepherd's-purse, and lamb's-quarters, so troublesome in gardens; the chickweed, growing everywhere; the prinpernel, celandine, and knawel; the lady's-thumb and May-weed; the common nettles and teazel; wild flax, stickseed, burweed, doorweed; all the mulleins; the most pestilent thistles, both the common sort and that which is erroneously called the Canada thistle; the sow thistles; the chess, corn-cockle, tares, bugloss, or blue-weed, and the pigeon-weed of the grain-fields; the darnel, yarrow, wild parsnip, ox-eye daisy, the wild garlick, the acrid buttercup, and the acrid St. John's-wort of the meadows; the nightshades, Jerusalem artichoke, wild radish, wild mustard, or charlock, the poison hemlock, the henbane—aye, even the very dandelion, a plant which we tread under foot at every turn. Others still might be added to the list, which were entirely unknown to the red man, having been introduced by the European race, and are now choking up all our waysides, forming the vast throng of foreign weeds. Some of these have come from a great distance, travelling round the world. The shepherd's-purse, with others, is common in China, on the most eastern coast of Asia. One kind of mallows belongs to the East Indies; another to the coast of the Mediterranean. The gimson weed, or Datura, is an Abyssinian plant, and the Nicandra came from Peru. It is supposed that the amaranths or green weeds, so very common here, have also been introduced, though possibly only from the more southern parts of our own country.

Some few American plants have been also carried to Europe, where they have become naturalized; but the number is very small. The evening primrose, and the silkweed, among others, have sowed themselves in some parts of the Old World, transported, no doubt, with the tobacco, and maise, and potato, which are now so widely diffused over the Eastern continent, to the very heart of Asia. But even at home, on our own soil, the amount of native weeds is small when compared with the throngs brought from the Old World. The wild cucumber, a very troublesome plant, the great white convolvulus, the dodder, the field sorrel, the pokeweed, the silkweed, with one or two plantains and thistles, of the rarer kinds, are among the most important of those whose origin is clearly settled as belonging to this continent. It is also singular, that among those tribes which are of a divided nature, some being natives, others being introduced, the last are generally the most numerous; for instance, the native chickweeds, and plantains, and thistles, are less common here than the European varieties.

There are other naturalized plants frequent in neglected spots, about farm-houses, and along roadsides, which have already become so common as to be weeds; the simples and medicinal herbs, used for ages by the good wives of England and Holland, were early brought over, and have very generally become naturalized—catnip, mint, horehound, tansy, balm, comfrey, elecampane, &c. &c.—immediately take root, spreading far and wide wherever they are allowed to grow. It is surprising how soon they become firmly established in a new settlement; we often observe them in this new country apart from any dwelling. At times we have found them nearly a mile from either garden or house. The seeds of naturalized plants seem, in many cases, to have floated across our lake upon the water; for we have found the European mint and catnip growing with the blue gentian immediately on the banks where the woods spread around in every direction for some distance.

The word weed varies much with circumstances; at times, we even apply it to the beautiful flower or the useful herb. A plant may be a weed, because it is noxious, or fetid, or unsightly, or troublesome, but it is rare indeed that all these faults are united in one individual of the vegetable race. Often the unsightly, or fetid, or even the poisonous plant, is useful, or it may be interesting from some peculiarity; and, on the other hand, many others, troublesome from their numbers, bear pleasing flowers, taken singly. Upon the whole, it is not so much a natural defect which marks the weed, as a certain impertinent, intrusive character in these plants; a want of modesty, a habit of shoving themselves forward upon ground where they are not needed, rooting themselves into soil intended for better things, for plants more useful, more fragrant, or more beautiful. Thus the corn-cockle bears a fine flower, not unlike the mullein-pink of the garden, but then it springs up among the precious wheat, taking the place of the grain, and it is a weed; the flower of the thistle is handsome in itself, but it is useless, and it pushes forward in throngs by the way-side until we are weary of seeing it, and everybody makes war upon it; the common St. John's wort, again, has a pretty yellow blossom, and it has its uses also as a simple, but it is injurious to the cattle, and yet it is so obstinately tenacious of a place among the grasses, that it is found in every meadow, and we quarrel with it as a weed.

These noxious plants have come unbidden to us, with the grains and grassess of the Old World, the evil with the good, as usual in this world of probation—the wheat and tares together. The useful plants produce a tenfold blessing upon the labor of man, but the weed is also there, ever accompanying his steps, to teach him a lesson of humility. Certain plants of this nature—the dock, thistle, nettle, &c. &c.—are known to attach themselves especially to the path of man; in widely different soils and climates, they are still found at his door. Patient care and toil can alone keep the evil within bounds, and it seems doubtful whether it lies with the reach of human means entirely to remove from the face of the earth one single plant of this peculiar nature, much less all their varieties. Has any one, even of the more noxious sorts, ever been utterly destroyed? Agriculture, with all the pride and power of science now at her command, has apparently accomplished but little in this way. Egypt and China are said to be countries in which weeds are comparatively rare; both regions have long been in a high state of cultivation, filled to overflowing with a hungry population, which neglects scarce a rood of the soil, and yet, even in those lands, upon the banks of the Nile, where the crops succeed each other without any interval throughout the whole year, leaving no time for weeds to extend themselves—even there, these noxious plants are not unknown; and the moment the soil is abandoned, only for a season, they return with renewed vigor.

In this new country, with a fresh soil, and a thinner population, we have not only weeds innumerable, but we observe, also, that briers and brambles seem to acquire double strength in the neighborhood of man; we meet them in the primitive forest, here and there, but they line our roads and fences, and the woods are no sooner felled to make ready for cultivation, than they spring up in profusion; the first natural produce of the soil. But in this world of mercy, the just curse is ever graciously tempered with a blessing; many a grateful fruit, and some of our most delightful flowers, grow among thorns and briers, their fragrance and excellence reminding man of sweets as well as the toils of his task. The sweet brier, more especially, with its simple flower and delightful fragrance, unknown in the wilderness, but moving onward by the side of the ploughman, would seem, of all others, the husbandman's blossom.—*Rural Hours.*

THE MIRACULOUS PICTURE AT RIMINI.

The Holy Coat of Treves, which caused so great a stir a few years back, is likely to be quite outdone and thrown into the shade by a new and wonderful exhibition which has just been set on foot at Rimini in the states of the Church. Certainly the Papal system, in spite of the changes which, like other institutions, it undergoes from the influence of time, preserves it identity in a remarkable manner. Nothing else which has come down to us from the middle ages is so like what it was a thousand years ago. Curious as it may seem, there is a decided tendency in the present age to return to the principles and practices of the most superstitious periods, rather than to adopt Catholicism by any rationalising concessions to the Protestant mind. From the time of the Reformation, until the end of the last century, it was the custom of enlightened Catholic Divines to disclaim many of the most popular usages as having no necessary connection with their faith, and even to resent as offensive the imputation that they were to be held in any way responsible for the legends and marvels of monkish history. But now nothing of the kind is too childish or incredible for the ardor of Catholic belief. The Catholicism which has become fashionable is not that of Pascal or Gerson, or of the great men who represented Rome at the early sittings at Trent, but the narrow and grovelling superstition of the most ignorant ages to which learning and refinement lend the weight of their influence. Pictures and relics, and the worship of Mary and the Saints, are obtaining votaries as fervent as ever were the Theresas and Dominicks, and, strange to say, the most thorough-going of these are to be found amongst the converts from Anglican Protestantism. Under other circumstances, we might imagine that the narrative to which we are about to refer would decisively repel any one who yet hesitated to submit his mind to the Roman Catholic system; but, when we see the relish with which superstitions are, in some instances, taken up, we are not sure that the miraculous picture of Rimini may not have the effect of expediting a few more travellers on the way from Oxford to Rome.

The new miracle is thus narrated, with every manifestation of the most devoted belief, in a leading article, by the *Tablet*, the chief organ of the Roman Catholics in Great Britain:—

"On the evening of Saturday, May 11th, 1850, the miracle to which we allude was first noticed in a chapel of the little Church of St. Clare, belonging to the Fathers Missioners of the precious Blood at Rimini. It was observed that a picture of the Blessed Virgin, honored under the title of Mother of Mercy, had moved its eyes. The picture is an oil-painting, and was at this time covered with glass and enclosed in a frame. Not very much attention was paid to the rumor that evening, but the next day (Sunday, the 12th), a great concourse having assembled in the church, the miraculous appearance was again observed. *La Madonna muove gli occhi!* 'The eyes move!' exclaimed several persons; the whole assemblage were agitated; in an instant every one rushed into the little chapel, which was thronged the whole day by the Faithful witnessing the marvel with emotions of awe, gratitude, and humiliation. The eyes of the picture moved, opened and shut. Many thousands of persons saw this fact. The crowd still kept increasing; an armed force was required to keep order. The Bishop who was absent from Rimini, on a visitation of his diocese, was sent for: he returned and, as we shall presently state, was a witness of the miracle. The glass and frame were removed from the picture, so that the canvas was left exposed, but the miraculous movements were seen as before, and under all atmospheric changes. By this time the whole neighboring population were crowding into Rimini to see this wonderful event with their own eyes; the streets and squares were thronged with people. Multitudes kept pouring in from all parts, Pesaro, Cesena, Forli, Faenza, Ravenna, &c., to behold the pictured face of the Blessed Virgin opening, shutting, raising, and bending her eyes every moment, in the gaze of the assembled thousands. The Austrian General came express from Bologna to Rimini, and was convinced of the reality of the miracle. Two Austrain officers, inclined as it was said, to infidelity, obtained leave of the Bishop to take the picture in their hands. Whilst they held it and examined it, 'the Madonna looked at them in such sort, they fell upon their knees,' and tearing off their decorations, offered them as *ex votos* to the Blessed Virgin."

—This is not all. The Bishop of Rimini went to satisfy himself. The Madonna looked at him, and he experienced such emotion that he fainted away. A neighboring Bishop sent one of his Canons to investigate the matter. The Canon doubtless wanted faith, for he could see nothing. The Bishop, however, went himself, and had the full benefit of the miracle. The Virgin raised her eyes, and "for five minutes he was able to contemplate the seven marvels of Paradise," until he could endure the beatific vision no longer. It need scarcely be said that, short as the interval is since the appearance of the prodigy, it has already produced extraordinary cures and conversions. Gold, silver, and precious offerings of all kinds, pour into the clerical treasury, and the devout who are able to make a pilgrimage to Rimini are supposed to have attained the summit of human felicity.

Those who have the slightest acquaintance with the old monkish legends, will think that the miracle of Rimini betrays a wonderful poverty of invention. There were times when a picture with moveable eyes, or an image which could let fall drops of real water as tears, might very well excite the veneration of simple-minded believers. But now, when we have daily experience of the scientific miracles of steam and electricity, when the ingenuities of mechanism are so cheap and common that every child's doll can do as much as the Madonna, it is truly wonderful to see such poor contrivances employed in the service of any system of religion.

That they are used however, and used with considerable success, may inspire us with some wholesome doubts as to the reality and extent of our much-boasted intellectual progress. We know far more of the exact sciences than our ancestors, but moral and religious ideas have not made an equal advance. Ignorance and credulity still have a vast hold upon the minds of men, and still resist or corrupt the pure gospel of Christ, even as they did when it was first promulgated. Those who cherish that gospel as the manifestation of God's power for the moral redemption of the human race, have still to defend it against the two sets of opponents whose extravangaces support and countenance each other. We cannot wonder that Infidelity, in every extreme form, should be prevalent and full of confidence, where exhibitions like that of Rimini are identified with the Christian faith; and on the other hand, we cannot be quite at a loss to explain the revival of such superstitions when we know how often minds of devout tendency find their impulses rudely shocked and repressed by a hard unsympathizing rationalism, which treats many of the more delicate workings of the religious faculty as symptoms of childishness and folly. For such evils there is no remedy, but the fervant and faithful preaching of pure Christianity. Religion must satisfy the wants both of the intellect and of the soul. Every faculty that man possesses must have it share in the faith on which his whole being is to rest. Whatever element of human nature is excluded becomes a source of disorder. The obligation therefore becomes greater upon those whose views are truly harmonious and comprehensive, to labor by word and act to make them known to the world in their integrity.—*London Inquirer.*

THE MOUNTAIN OF LIGHT.

Her Majesty's steam sloop Meda has just arrived at Portsmouth, with a freight more precious, in nominal value, than was ever carried from Peru to Cadiz. Major Mackeson, one of her passengers, a meritorious and distinguished officer, brings with him that famous diamond of the East called, in the fondness of Asiatic hyperbole, the Koh-i-noor, or *Mountain of Light*, which, after symbolizing the revolutions of ten generations by its passage from one conqueror to another, comes now, in the third centenary of its discovery, as the forfeit of Oriental faithlessness and the prize of Saxon valor, to the distant shores of England.

It was in the year 1550, before the Mogul dynasty had been established by the prowess of the great Akbar, that this marvellous stone was first brought to light in the celebrated mines of Golconda. The kingdom of this name constituted one of the five Mahometan States which, toward the close of the XVth century, had been formed in the Deccan.—The diamond mines which have rendered it so famous in story, were situated at some distance to the east of the capital city, near the present station of Condapilly, and are now in our possession, though they have long ceased to reward or invite the labors of treasure-seekers. When the Mogul Princes extended their pretensions to the sovereignty of the Deccan, Kootub Shah, then King of Golconda, was brought into collision with Shah Jehaun, the reigning Emperor, and father of the great Aurungzebe. Kootub Shah's Prime Minister at this period was the famous Meer Jumba, a statesman who, to political abilities of unusual excellence, added singular knowledge of precious stones. He had, in fact, been at one time a diamond merchant, and was therefore peculiarly competent to appreciate the treasures of Golconda. It happened, too, that Shah Jehaun himself was a connoisseur of scarcely less skill, insomuch that when, at a later period, he had been dethroned and imprisoned by his father, and a doubt had been created respecting the value of a certain ruby in the Imperial Treasury, the gem was actually transmitted to the deposed Prince for his inspection and decision. Two such characters were well fitted for the transaction which ensued. Shah Jehaun took up the cause of Neer Jumla against his Sovereign, and the Koh-i-noor passed from Golconda to Delhi.

While the kingdoms of the Deccan were successively absorbed in the culminating dominion of the Moguls, the Koh-i-noor rested among the treasures of Imperial Delhi, where, on the 2d of November, 1665, it was seen by the French traveller Tavernier, who, by the extraordinary indulgence of Aurungzebe, was permitted to handle, examine and weigh it, being the first and till now probably the last European who had ever enjoyed such a privilege.—The Great Mogul sat on his throne of state, while the chief keeper of the jewels produced his jewels for inspection on two golden dishes. The magnificence of the collection was indescribable, but conspicuous in lustre, esteem and value was the Koh-i-noor. Sometimes worn on the person of the Moguls, sometimes adorning the famous peacock throne, this inestimable gem was safely preserved at Delhi, until, in 1739, the empire received its fatal blow from the invasion of Nadir Shah. Among the spoils of conquest which the Persian warrior carried back with him in triumph to Khorassen, and which have been variously estimated as worth from 30 to 90 millions sterling, the Koh-i-noor was the most precious trophy; but it was destined to pass from Persia as quickly as that ephemeral supremacy in virtue of which it had been acquired. Nadir Shah had entertained in his service a body of Affghans of the Abdallee tribe, under the leadership of Ahmed Shah, who also served his master in the capacity of treasurer, and when the Persian conqueror was assassinated by his subjects, the Affghans, after vainly endeavoring to rescue or avenge him, fought their way to their own frontiers, though only 4,000 strong, through the hosts of the Persian army. In conducting this intrepid retreat, Ahmed Shah carried off with him the treasures in his possession, and was probably aided by these means, as well as by his own valor, in consolidating the new State which, under the now familiar title of the Doorannee Empire, he speedily created in Cabul. It seemed as if the Koh-i-noor carried with it the sovereignty of Hindostan, for the conquests of Ahmed were as decisive as those of Nadir, and it was by his nomination and patronage that the last Emperor ascended the throne of the Moguls.

At the beginning of the present century the treasures and power of Ahmed were vested in the person of Zemaun Shah, subject to the incessant assaults of his kinsmen. One of these at length proved successful, and in the year 1800 Zemaun Shah found himself a prisoner at the disposal of his brother Shah Shuja, the identical puppet, 40 years later, of our famous Cabul expedition, so that we are now brought down to modern times and characters.—Shah Shuja presently ascended the throne of his brother, but the treasury of Cabul was wanting in its most precious ornament, till at length, ingeniously secreted in the wall of Zemrun Shah's prison was discovered the Koh-i-noor. It was eight years after this, while the Doorannee monarchy was still formidable enough to inspire the powers of the East with uneasiness, that Mr. Elphinstone, accredited by Lord Minto to the Affghan Prince, betook himself to what was then the remote and unknown town of Peshawur, where, at his state reception, the Kohn i-noor again flashed, after an interval of so many years, upon the dazzled eyes of a European. Shah Shuja, afterward the client and pensioner of the East India Company, was dressed on this occasion in a green velvet tunic, fitting closely to his body, and seamed with gold and precious stones. On his breast was a cuirass of diamonds shaped like two flattened *fleurs-de-lis*, and in a bracelet on his right arm blazed the priceless jewel of Golconda. The Prince gave a gracious audience to the Ambassador, and Mr. Elphinstone retired, but the Koh-i-noor was not fated long to continue in the divided and tottering family of the once powerful Abdallees.

The embassy had scarcely recrossed the Indus, when Shah Shuja was expelled from Cabul, though he contrived to make this far-famed diamond the companion of his flight. After many vicissitudes of exile and contest he at length found an equivocal refuge under the protection of that powerful chieftain who had now consolidated the dominions of the Sikhs into a Royal inheritance for his own family. Runjeet Singh was fully competent either to the defence or the restoration of the fugitive, but he knew and suspected the treasure in his possession, and his mind was bent upon acquiring it. He put the Shah under strict surveillance, and made a formal demand for the jewel. The Doorannee Prince hesitated, prevaricated, temporized, and employed all artifices of Oriental diplomacy, but in vain.—Runjeet redoubled the stringency of his measures, and at length the 1st of June, 1813, was fixed as the day when the great diamond of the Moguls should be surrendered by the Abdalee Chief to the ascendant dynasty of the Singhs. The two Princes met in a room appointed for the purpose, and took their seats on the ground. A solemn silence then ensued which continued unbroken for an hour. At length Runjeet's impatience overcame the suggestion of Asiatic decorum, and he whispered to an attendant to quicken the memory of the Shah. The exiled Prince spoke not a word in reply, but gave a signal with his eyes to a eunuch in attendance, who retiring for a moment, returned with a small roll which he sat down upon the carpet mid-way between the two chiefs. Again a pause followed, when at a sign from Runjeet the roll was unfolded, and there in its matchless and unspeakable brilliancy glittered the Koh-i-noor.

In this way did the "Mountain of light" pass in the train of conquest and as the emblem of dominion, from Golconda to Delhi, from Delhi to Mushed, from Mushed to Cabul, and from Cabul to Lahore, verifying by the esteem which it everywhere commanded the perspicacity and judgment of Meer Jumla (who is the Mirsimola of Tavernier's travels) and the Prince Shah Jehaun. Excepting the somewhat doubtful claims of the Brazilian stone among the Crown jewels of Portugal, the Koh-i-noor is the largest known diamond in the world. When first given to Shah Jehaun it was still uncut, weighing, it is said, in that rough state, nearly 800 carats, which were reduced by the unskilfulness of the artist to 279, its present weight. It was cut by Hortensio Borgis, a Venetian, who instead of receiving a remuneration for his labor, was fined 10,000 rupees for his wastefulness by the enraged Mogul. In form it is a "rose-cut"—that is to say, it is cut to a point in a series of small faces or "facets," without any tabular surface. A good general idea may be formed of its shape and size by conceiving it as the pointed half of a small hen's egg, though it is said not to have risen more than half an inch from the gold setting in which it was worn by Runjeet. Its value is scarcely computable, though two millions sterling has been mentioned as a justifiable price if calculated by the scale employed in the trade. The Pitt diamond, brought over from Madras by the grandfather of Lord Chatham, and sold to the Regent Orleans in 1717 for 125,000*l* weighs scarcely 130 carats; nor does the great diamond which supports the Eagle on the summit of the Russian scepire weigh as much as 200. Such is the extraordinary jewel which in virtue of conquest and sovereignty has passed into the possession of England. It was prudently secured among the few remaining valuables of the Lahore Treasury at the commencement of the last insurrection, and although even its nominal value would be inadequate compensation for the cost of the Sikh wars, we may look upon its acquisition as a fitting symbol of that supremacy which we